



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



AH 278D E

# Proceedings of the Baptist Congress

---

at Chicago, Illinois, 1908

## Topics

- I. Does the New Testament Contemplate the Church as an Institution?
- II. What are the Legitimate Limits of Free Speech in a Republic?
- III. The Doctrine of Atonement in Terms of Modern Thought.
- IV. What Definite Steps Should be Immediately Taken Toward the Organic Union of Baptists, Free Baptists, and Disciples of Christ?
- V. Is Psycho-Therapeutics a Function of the Church?
- VI. Christ's Prayer for Unity.

# Baptist Congress

Report of W. B. Matteson, Treasurer, for the Year ending  
September 30th, 1908

## Receipts

Balance from last year		\$12.47
From General Conference	\$839.80	
From Annual Meetings	44.85	
	<hr/>	\$884.65
Sale of Proceedings	124.62	
Personal Donations	30.00	
Central (New York City) S. C.	15.00	
Grand Rapids (Mich.) Church	10.00	
Reg. Dist. (N. Y.) Church	10.00	
	<hr/>	\$5.00
Colporteur	47.00	
	<hr/>	\$107.17
		<hr/>
		\$1,026.82

## Expenditures

Traveling Expenses, Baltimore,	\$365.08
To Proceedings	124.62
Stationery and Printing	20.36
Postage and Express	37.37
Clerical and other help	40.95
Education	2.34
Interest on Expense	20.00
	<hr/>
	\$7,034.44
Balance on hand	\$14.40

Twenty-Sixth Annual Session

OF THE

# Baptist Congress

Joint Session of  
Baptists, Free Baptists, and Disciples of Christ

The Memorial Church of Christ,  
Chicago, Ill.

---

November 10, 11, and 12, 1908

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS  
CHICAGO AND NEW YORK

1909

FEB 1 1909

*Divinity School*

Published January 1909

Composed and Printed By  
The University of Chicago Press  
Chicago, Illinois, U. S. A.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
<b>PROCEEDINGS:</b>	
I. DOES THE NEW TESTAMENT CONTEMPLATE THE CHURCH AS AN INSTITUTION? . . . . .	3
PROFESSOR JOHN H. LOGAN, PH.D.	
REV. A. W. FORTUNE.	
REV. W. B. WALLACE, D.D.	
PROFESSOR SHIRLEY J. CASE, PH.D.	
II. ADDRESSES OF WELCOME . . . . .	40
PRESIDENT HARRY PRATT JUDSON, LL.D.	
RIGHT REV. SAMUEL FALLOWS, D.D., LL.D.	
RESPONSE . . . . .	45
PRESIDENT AND REV. JOHN L. JACKSON, D.D.	
III. WHAT ARE THE LEGITIMATE LIMITS OF FREE SPEECH IN A REPUBLIC? . . . . .	47
HON. WALLACE HECKMAN.	
PROFESSOR JAMES Q. DEALEY, PH.D.	
REV. BAYARD CRAIG, D.D.	
REV. CARL D. CASE, PH.D.	
IV. THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT IN TERMS OF MODERN THOUGHT . . . . .	81
REV. B. A. JENKINS, D.D.	
REV. FREDERICK LENT, PH.D.	
PROFESSOR LEROY WATERMAN, PH.D.	
PROFESSOR ALLAN HOBEN, PH.D.	
DISCUSSION . . . . .	110
PROFESSOR G. B. FOSTER, D.D.	
PROFESSOR FRANKLIN JOHNSON, D.D.	
PROFESSOR G. B. SMITH.	
REV. W. L. HAYDEN.	
REV. SAMUEL ZANE BATTEN.	
V. WHAT DEFINITE STEPS SHOULD BE IMMEDIATELY TAKEN TOWARD THE ORGANIC UNION OF BAPTISTS, FREE BAPTISTS, AND DISCIPLES OF CHRIST? . . . . .	123
REV. I. J. SPENCER, LL.D.	
REV. L. A. CRANDALL, D.D.	
DISCUSSION . . . . .	141
DR. JOSEPH W. MAUCK, LL.D.	
DR. HERBERT L. WILLETT.	

DR. ALBERT G. LAWSON.  
 DR. HENRY M. FORD.  
 DR. J. H. GARRISON.  
 REV. J. STANLEY DURKEE, PH.D.

VI. IS PSYCHO-THERAPEUTICS A FUNCTION OF THE CHURCH? . . . 158

REV. ROBERT MACDONALD, D.D.  
 REV. J. STANLEY DURKEE, PH.D.  
 REV. ALLAN B. PHILPUTT.  
 REV. RUFUS P. JOHNSTON, D.D.

DISCUSSION . . . . . 194

RIGHT REV. SAMUEL FALLOWS, D.D., LL.D.  
 PROFESSOR GEORGE B. FOSTER.  
 DR. BAYARD CRAIG.  
 REV. THOMAS MOODY.  
 DR. CARL D. CASE.

VII. CHRIST'S PRAYER FOR UNITY . . . . . 206

REV. A. W. JEFFERSON.  
 REV. VERNON STAUFFER.  
 REV. HENRY M. SANDERS, D.D.

VIII. CLOSING WORDS . . . . . 234

REV. HERBERT L. WILLETT.  
 REV. BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.  
 REV. J. H. GARRISON.  
 REV. W. C. BITTING, D.D.  
 PROFESSOR ERRETT GATES, PH.D.  
 PRESIDENT AND REV. JOHN L. JACKSON, D.D.

# BAPTIST CONGRESS

## PLAN OF ORGANIZATION

1. *The object* of the Congress is to promote a healthful sentiment among Baptists through free and courteous discussion of current questions by suitable persons.

2. *The work* of the Congress shall be subject to the control of a General Committee of one hundred members or more. The Committee shall be composed of persons who have consented to contribute five dollars or more annually toward the expenses of the Congress.

3. *The General Committee* shall elect a permanent Executive Committee of fifteen persons residing in, or near, the city of New York, at the meetings of which Executive Committee any member of the General Committee may be present and vote; and to this Executive Committee shall be intrusted, except as may have been already provided for by the General Committee, entire control over the public meetings—e. g., determination of the time and place, the number of days and sessions each day, selection of the presiding officer, the topics, the appointed writers and speakers, the provision for volunteer speakers, and rules of discussion. The Executive Committee shall also secure a full stenographic report of the proceedings, and funds to meet any other necessary expense.

4. *A Secretary* shall be elected, who shall also be Secretary of the Executive Committee, and of the public meetings, the expenses of whose correspondence, etc., shall be met by a tax levied by the Executive Committee upon the General Committee.

5. *The General Committee* shall meet in connection with the public meetings, and when called together by the Executive Committee.

6. *The Executive Committee* shall secure the appointment of a local committee in the city or town where a public meeting is to be held, which shall provide a suitable place for the Congress, entertainment for the officers, and appointees of the Congress.

7. *Any member* of a Baptist Congregation may become an Annual Member of this Congress, and thus be entitled to all its privileges, and to a copy of the published proceedings, by the payment of the sum of two dollars.

## RULES OF DISCUSSION

1. *The chairman* of the Congress shall be appointed by the Executive Committee, and on all points of order his decision shall be final.

2. *Any member* of a Baptist Congregation who, by sending his card



to the Secretary, shall signify his willingness to speak on the topic under discussion, may be called upon by the Chairman.

3. *All writers* and speakers shall take the platform, address only the Chair, and confine themselves to the subject assigned for the occasion.

4. *No person* shall speak twice on the same subject.

5. *Readers of papers* shall be allowed twenty-five minutes, appointed speakers<sup>1</sup> twenty minutes, and volunteer speakers ten minutes. The Secretary shall notify all participants by stroke of the bell three minutes before, and also at the expiration of their time, beyond which no one shall be allowed to proceed.

6. *No paper* shall be read in the absence of its writer, nor shall any paper be printed in the *Proceedings* except it has been read at the meeting.

7. *No resolution* or motion shall be entertained at the public conferences.

<sup>1</sup> Appointed speakers must not use MS, the object of their appointment being to encourage the volunteer discussion which follows their addresses.

## OFFICERS OF THE CHICAGO MEETING

### *President*

REV. JOHN L. JACKSON, D.D., Chicago

### *Vice-Presidents*

PROFESSOR HERBERT L. WILLETT, PH.D., Chicago

PRESIDENT JOS. W. MAUCK, LL.D., Hillsdale, Mich.

### *Secretary*

THEO. A. K. GESSLER, D.D., Landing, N. J.

### *Treasurer*

W. B. MATTESON, D.D., Red Bank, N. J.

### CHICAGO LOCAL COMMITTEE

PROFESSOR HERBERT L. WILLETT, PH.D., *Chairman*

REV. R. N. VAN DOREN, D.D., *Secretary*

WILLARD A. SMITH, ESQ.

REV. C. G. KINDRED

HON. FRANCIS W. PARKER

LEON LOEHR, ESQ.

J. G. ELSDON, ESQ.

REV. PARKER STOCKDALE

JOHN NUVEEN, ESQ.

REV. ERRETT GATES, PH.D.

GEORGE T. WEBB, ESQ.

E. M. BOWMAN, ESQ.

### *Stenographer*

NEIL SATTERLEE

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CONGRESS

HENRY M. SANDERS, D.D., *Chairman*

REV. JAMES M. BRUCE

ALBERT G. LAWSON, D.D.

FRANK M. GOODCHILD, D.D.

RIVINGTON D. LORD, D.D.

WILLIAM A. GRANGER, D.D.

REV. ROBERT MACDONALD, PH.D.

RUFUS P. JOHNSTON, D.D.

J. HERMAN RANDALL, D.D.

WILLIAM M. LAWRENCE, D.D.

REV. E. T. TOMLINSON, PH.D.

THEO. A. K. GESSLER, D.D., *Secretary*

W. B. MATTESON, D.D., *Treasurer*

## THE GENERAL COMMITTEE

Aked, Charles F., D.D.....New York City

Anderson, T. D., D.D.....Albany, N. Y.

Andrews, President E. Benjamin, LL.D.....Lincoln, Neb.

Anthony, Professor, A. W., D.D.....	Lewiston, Me.
Applegate, Hon. J. S., LL.D.....	Red Bank, N. J.
Armstrong, Hon. E. A.....	Camden, N. J.
Baker, Mrs. E. L.....	Adrian, Mich.
Baldwin, Jesse A.....	Chicago, Ill.
Barbour, C. A., D.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Barbour, T. S., D.D.....	Wollaston, Mass.
Barnes, L. C., D.D.....	New York City
Barnes, H. W., D.D.....	Binghamton, N. Y.
Barney, Mr. Eugene J.....	Dayton, Ohio
Batten, S. Z., D.D.....	Lincoln, Neb.
Beaver, Mr. F. P.....	Dayton, Ohio
Berry, Professor George R., D.D.....	Hamilton, N. Y.
Bigelow, Mr. L. H.....	New York City
Bitting, W. C., D.D.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Boyd, Mr. S. G.....	Covington, Ky.
Braislín, Edward, D.D.....	Boston, Mass.
Brown, Mr. Samuel N.....	Boston, Mass.
Brownell, Rev. Clark T.....	Newark, N. J.
Bruce, Rev. James M.....	New York City
Bryan, E. B., Ph.D.....	Franklin, Ind.
Burdette, Robert J., D.D.....	Los Angeles, Cal.
Burggraf, Mr. G. A.....	New York City
Burnham, Professor S., D.D.....	Hamilton, N. Y.
Burton, Professor Ernest D., D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Burton, N. S., D.D.....	Ann Arbor, Mich.
Butler, Mrs. Maria E.....	New York City
Calley, Walter, D.D.....	Upland, Pa.
Carpenter, Mr. Aaron A.....	Port Chester, N. Y.
Case, Rev. C. D., Ph.D.....	Buffalo, N. Y.
Cate, Carter E., D.D.....	Providence, R. I.
Chamberlain, Mr. Williard D.....	Dayton, Ohio
Cheney, Rev. J. L., Ph.D.....	Wheaton, Ill.
Clark, Mr. E. J.....	Baltimore, Md.
Clarke, Professor W. N., D.D.....	Hamilton, N. Y.
Clinch, Hon. Edward S.....	New York City
Colby, Hon. Everett.....	Newark, N. J.
Colby, H. F., D.D.....	Dayton, Ohio
Colgate, Mr. James C.....	New York City
Colgate, Mr. Richard M.....	West Orange, N. J.

Colgate, Mr. Sidney M.....New York City  
 Colwell, H. S., D.D.....Granville, Ohio  
 Conwell, Russell H., D.D.....Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Cook, R. B., D.D.....Wilmington, Del.  
 Craig, W. B., D.D.....Denver, Colo.  
 Crandall, L. A., D.D.....Minneapolis, Minn.  
 Cuthbert, Mr. Herman G.....Grand Rapids, Mich.

Davis, Mr. F. H.....Elizabeth, N. J.  
 de Blois, A. K., Ph.D., LL.D.....Chicago, Ill.  
 Dickerson, Mr. Frank.....New York City  
 Dimock, Mr. G. E.....Elizabeth, N. J.  
 Dodd, Charles H., D.D.....Baltimore, Md.

Eaches, O. P., D.D.....Hightstown, N. J.  
 Evans, Professor M. G., D.D.....Chester, Pa.

Farnham, E. P., D.D.....Richmond Hill, N. Y.  
 Faunce, President W. H. P., D.D., LL.D.....Providence, R. I.  
 Ferris, George H., D.D.....Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Fikes, M. P., D.D.....Detroit, Mich.  
 Fischer, Mr. W. J.....St. Louis, Mo.  
 Fosdick, Rev. H. E.....Montclair, N. J.  
 Foster, Professor Geo. B.....Chicago, Ill.

Garabrant, Mr. D. G.....Bloomfield, N. J.  
 Gates, Professor Errett, Ph.D.....Chicago, Ill.  
 Gates, Mr. I. E.....New York City  
 Gessler, T. A. K., D.D.....Landing, N. J.  
 Gifford, O. P., D.D.....Brookline, Mass.  
 Goodchild, F. M., D.D.....New York City  
 Goodchild, Mrs. F. M.....New York City  
 Granger, W. A., D.D.....Mt. Vernon, N. Y.  
 Gray, Rev. Clifton D., Ph.D.....Boston, Mass.  
 Grenell, Z., D.D.....Detroit, Mich.  
 Grippin, Mr. William A.....Bridgeport, Conn.  
 Gurley, Mr. W. F.....Troy, N. Y.

Hagerman, Mr. Jos. G.....Red Bank, N. J.  
 Hedstrom, Mr. A. E.....Buffalo, N. Y.  
 Hegeman, Mr. John R.....New York City  
 Hills, Mr. William.....New York City

Hobart, Professor A. S., D.D.....Upland, Pa.  
 Holton, H. D., M.D.....Brattleboro, Vt.  
 Horr, President George E., D.D.....Newton Center, Mass.  
 Hubbard, Mr. Harry.....New York City  
 Hughes, Governor Charles E., LL.D.....Albany, N. Y.  
 Hunt, President Emory W., LL.D.....Granville, Ohio  
 Hyde, Rev. J. Chester.....Dexter, Me.

Jackson, J. L., D.D.....Chicago, Ill.  
 Jefferson, Albert W., D.D.....Portland, Me.  
 Johnson, Rev. Herbert S.....Boston, Mass.  
 Johnston, J. T. M., D.D.....St. Louis, Mo.  
 Johnston, R. P., D.D.....New York City  
 Jones, Carter Helm, D.D.....Oklahoma City, Okla.  
 Jones, Howard L., D.D.....Charleston, S. C.  
 Jones, M. Ashby, D.D.....Columbus, Ga.  
 Judd, Mr. Orrin R.....Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 Judson, President H. P., LL.D.....Chicago, Ill.

Keen, Professor W. W., M.D., LL.D.....Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Kenyon, Hon. James S.....Providence, R. I.

Lawrence, William M., D.D.....East Orange, N. J.  
 Laws, Curtis Lee, D.D.....Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 Lawson, Albert G., D.D.....New York City  
 Lent, Rev. Frederick, Ph.D.....New Haven, Conn.  
 Levering, Mr. Eugene.....Baltimore, Md.  
 Lincoln, Mr. William E.....Pittsburg, Pa.  
 Lindsley, Mr. W. L.....Pittsburg, Pa.  
 Logan, Professor John H.....Hamilton, N. Y.  
 Lord, Rivington D., D.D.....Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 Loux, Rev. Edward.....New York City

MacDonald, Robert, D.D.....Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 MacDonald, Mrs. Robert.....Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 McDonald, Mr. William.....Albany, N. Y.  
 McKibben, Mr. W. K.....Seattle, Wash.  
 McLeish, Mr. Andrew.....Chicago, Ill.  
 McNally, Rev. C. R.....Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 Marston, Mr. Edgar L.....New York City  
 Marvin, J. B., M.D., LL.D.....Louisville, Ky.  
 Mathews, Professor E. B.....Baltimore, Md.

Matteson, W. B., D.D.....	Red Bank, N. J.
Mauck, President Jos. W., LL.D.....	Hillsdale, Mich.
Meeser, S. B., D.D.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Milbank, Mr. Joseph.....	New York City
Moore, Addison, D.D.....	Jersey City, N. J.
Mott, Mrs. E. E.....	New York City
Mullins, President E. Y., D.D., LL.D.....	Louisville, Ky.
Murray, Mr. George Wellwood.....	Montclair, N. J.
Nuveen, Mr. John.....	Chicago, Ill.
Parker, A. K., D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Parmly, Mr. Randolph, A.M.....	New York City
Parsons, Mr. Chas. W.....	New York City
Parsons, Major Charles B.....	Red Bank, N. J.
Pease, Mr. John D.....	New York City
Porter, Hon. H. K.....	Pittsburg, Pa.
Randall, J. H., D.D.....	New York City
Rauschenbusch, Professor Walter, D.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Rhees, President Rush, D.D., LL.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Roe, Mr. Charles M.....	Battle Creek, Mich.
Rosselle, Rev. W. Quay, Ph.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Rowland, A. J., D.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Rullman, Mr. Henry D.....	Baltimore, Md.
Sampey, Professor John R., D.D.....	Louisville, Ky.
Samson, Thomas S., D.D.....	Germantown, Pa.
Sanders, Henry M., D.D.....	New York City
Schulte, Mr. Theo. E.....	New York City
Scott, Rev. Walter.....	North Cambridge, Mass.
Shallenberger, Hon. William S.....	Rochester, Pa.
Shaud, Mr. Miles M.....	Washington, D. C.
Silver, Mr. Edgar O.....	East Orange, N. J.
Slocum, President A. G., LL.D.....	Kalamazoo, Mich.
Snape, John.....	Utica, N. Y.
Spalding, C. H., D.D.....	Boston, Mass.
Stevenson, Mr. George K.....	Pittsburg, Pa.
Stickney, W. W.....	Ludlow, Vt.
Stilwell, H. F., D.D.....	Cleveland, Ohio
Stoddard, Ira J., D.D.....	Plainfield, N. J.
Stott, W. T., D.D.....	Kingstown, Md.

Strong, President A. H., D.D., LL.D.....Rochester, N. Y.  
 Strong, Professor J. H.....Rochester, N. Y.  
 Sutphen, Mr. C. Edgar.....Newark, N. J.

Thresher, Mr. E. M.....Dayton, Ohio  
 Thresher, Mr. J. B.....Dayton, Ohio  
 Tomlinson, Rev. E. T., Ph.D.....Elizabeth, N. J.  
 Torrence, Hon. Francis J.....Pittsburg, Pa.  
 Tustin, Hon. Ernest L.....Philadelphia, Pa.

Waldbach, Rev. Wm. F.....Chicago, Ill.  
 Welch, Mr. Pierce N.....New Haven, Conn.  
 Wells, Mr. F. A.....Chicago, Ill.  
 White, Mr. Edward D.....Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 Williams, Leighton, D.D.....New York City  
 Wishart, Rev. A. W., Ph.D.....Grand Rapids, Mich.  
 Woods, E. A., D.D.....Somerville, N. J.  
 Woodward, Mr. S. W.....Washington, D. C.

### ANNUAL MEMBERS

Abbott, Mr. Augustus L.....St. Louis, Mo.  
 Adams, George D., D.D.....Baltimore, Md.  
 Ames, Prof. E. S., Ph.D.....Chicago, Ill.  
 Anderson, Professor F. L., D.D.....Newton Center, Mass.  
 Ashworth, Rev. Robert A.....Meriden, Conn.

Barry, Mr. Charles C.....Melrose, Mass.  
 Bates, President Miner Lee.....Hiram, Ohio  
 Betteridge, Professor W. R., D.D.....Rochester, N. Y.  
 Bickmore, Professor A. S., LL.D.....New York City  
 Blair, Rev. V. W.....Greenfield, Ind.  
 Bonsall, Rev. A. J., Litt. D.....Allegheny, Pa.  
 Bosworth, Rev. R. B.....Rockford, Ill.  
 Boville, R. G., D.D.....New York City  
 Bowman, E. M.....Chicago, Ill.  
 Bradbury, Rev. Woodman.....Cambridge, Mass.  
 Brockett, Hon. E. J.....East Orange, N. J.  
 Bronk, Rev. Mitchell, Ph.D.....Bayonne, N. J.  
 Brown, Professor Charles Rufus, D.D.....Newton Center, Mass.  
 Brown, Rev. Charles S.....Cincinnati, Ohio  
 Brown, Rev. John R.....Providence, R. I.

Brown, T. Edwin, D.D.....	New Britain, Conn.
Bullen, George, D.D.....	Needham, Mass.
Burnham, Rev. F. W.....	Springfield, Ill.
Bustard, Rev. W. W.....	Boston, Mass.
Butler, Professor Nathaniel, D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Cant, Mr. Andrew.....	Buffalo, N. Y.
Carman, Rev. A. S.....	Granville, Ohio
Carpenter, Mr. I. W.....	Omaha, Neb.
Carroll, Professor Mitchell.....	Washington, D. C.
Carver, Professor W. O.....	Louisville, Ky.
Chard, Mr. James F.....	Buffalo, N. Y.
Clare, Rev. Daniel H.....	Hamilton, N. Y.
Colby, Mr. Gardner.....	New York City
Cole, Rev. Arthur S.....	Manasquan, N. J.
Conant, Thos. O., LL.D.....	New York City
Conklin, Rev. J. C.....	Trenton, N. J.
Crossley, Mr. J. H.....	Bridgeport, Conn.
Davis, Mr. E. G.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Dayton, Mr. A. A.....	Albany, N. Y.
Delamater, N. B.....	Chicago, Ill.
DeWolf, Rev. D.....	Newark, N. J.
Dickerson, Mr. J. S.....	Chicago, Ill.
Dickinson, J. T., D.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Donovan, Professor W. N.....	Newton Center, Mass.
Drake, Mr. H. E.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Dunning, Mr. Amos W.....	Haverhill, Mass.
Durkee, Rev. J. Stanley, Ph.D.....	Roxbury, Mass.
Dussman, Rev. John.....	Gurzalla, India
Elliott, Mr. A. J.....	Peoria, Ill.
Elmer, Rev. F. D.....	Winsted, Conn.
Ennis, Mr. M. J.....	New York City
Fennell, Rev. W. G.....	Hartford, Conn.
Forbes, Professor G. M.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Fortune, Rev. A. W.....	Cincinnati, O.
Foster, Rev. Allyn K.....	Cornwall, Conn.
Fowler, Mr. B. F.....	Haddonfield, N. J.
Francis, Rev. J. A.....	Rye, N. Y.
Franklin, Rev. J. H.....	Colorado Springs, Colo.
Gallup, Mr. John.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Garrison, J. H., LL.D.....	St. Louis, Mo.



Garton, Rev. J. V.....West Somerville, Mass.  
 Gill, Rev. Everett.....Kent, Eng.  
 Glover, Mrs. H. R.....Cambridge, Mass.  
 Grant, Mr. Schuyler.....Detroit, Mich.  
 Greene, B. A., D.D.....Evanston, Ill.  
 Greene, President J. P., D.D.....Liberty, Mo.  
 Greene, S. H., D.D., LL.D.....Washington, D. C.  
 Greul, Frederick B., D.D.....Haverhill, Mass.  
 Grout, Mr. T. J.....New York City

Hare, Rev. J. Madison.....Jersey City, N. J.  
 Harris, President J. H., Ph.D., LL.D.....Lewisburg, Pa.  
 Hartwell, Mr. F. W.....Providence, R. I.  
 Haskell, Edward H.....Boston, Mass.  
 Hatt, Mr. Samuel S.....Albany, N. Y.  
 Hayden, Rev. W. L.....Indianapolis, Ind.  
 Henderson, Professor C. R., D.D.....Chicago, Ill.  
 Henson, L. L., D.D.....Lawrenceville, Ill.  
 Hoben, Professor Allan, Ph.D.....Chicago, Ill.  
 Holmes, Rev. H. C.....Providence, R. I.  
 Holyoke, Edw. M., D.D.....Providence, R. I.  
 Howe, Rev. T. C.....Indianapolis, Ind.  
 Hoyt, Wayland, D.D.....Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Huhns, Rev. F.....Houston Heights, Tex.  
 Hull, Rev. R. C.....Summit, N. J.

Jennings, Mr. A. E.....Detroit, Mich.  
 Johnson, Professor Franklin, D.D.....Chicago, Ill.  
 Jones, Mr. L. B.....Wilmington, Del.  
 Jones, Philip L., D.D.....Philadelphia, Pa.

Kelley, Claude, D.D.....Bellevue, Pa.  
 Knapp, Rev. E. E.....Amsterdam, N. Y.  
 Knox, Superintendent George Platt.....St. Louis, Mo.

Lawson, Professor George B.....Saxton River, Vt.  
 L'Hommedieu, Rev. J. B.....Greenwich, N. Y.  
 Leshner, Mr. A. L.....New York City  
 Lindsley, Mr. Irenaeus.....Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Loxley, Mr. B. Ogden.....Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Lyell, John W., D.D.....Camden, N. J.  
 Lynn, Rev. J. E.....Warren, O.

Mabie, Professor Henry C., D.D.	Rochester, N. Y.
MacAlpine, Rev. C. A.	Rochester, N. Y.
MacMurray, Rev. D. A.	Brooklyn, N. Y.
McGlothlin, Professor A. J.	Louisville, Ky.
McLean, Rev. A.	Cincinnati, Ohio
Magill, Rev. David T.	Chicago, Ill.
Marble, Rev. F. E., Ph.D.	Cambridge, Mass.
Mathews, Professor Shailer, D.D.	Chicago, Ill.
Maxson, Rev. C. H.	Marquette, Mich.
Merriam, E. F., D.D.	Boston, Mass.
Moody, Rev. Thomas	Matadi, Congo
Moore, Mr. Paul	St. Louis, Mo.
Mosely, Mr. John	Needham, Mass.
Moss, Rev. C. H.	Malden, Mass.
Needham, President C. W.	Washington, D. C.
Neubauer, Rev. Eugene	Bloomington, Ind.
Norton, Rev. F. W.	Hiram, Ohio
Oeschger, Rev. Wm.	Vincennes, Ind.
Osborne, Mr. G. P.	Cincinnati, Ohio
Osborne, Mr. Thomas D.	Louisville, Ky.
Owen, Rev. William Russell	Baltimore, Md.
Packer, Professor E. E.	Albany, N. Y.
Parker, Rev. F. C. W.	Washington
Partridge, Warren G., D.D.	Pittsburg, Pa.
Pattison, F. W.	New Haven, Conn.
Pattison, Rev. Harold	St. Paul, Minn.
Peaver, Mr. Frank W.	New York City
Penny, Rev. F. D.	Burlington, Vt.
Phillips, J. W., Ph.D., D.D.	Binghamton, N. Y.
Philputt, Rev. Allan B.	Indianapolis, Ind.
Philputt, Rev. Jas. M., D.D.	St. Louis, Mo.
Pinkham, Rev. Henry W.	Denver, Colo.
Pollard, Professor E. B., Ph.D., D.D.	Chester, Pa.
Powers, Frederick D., D.D.	Washington, D. C.
Quay, George M., M.D.	East Cleveland, Ohio
Reese, G. E., D.D.	Philadelphia, Pa.
Rhoades, W. C. P., D.D.	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Rice, Lee P. J.	Minneapolis, Minn.

Richardson, Rev. W. S.....New York City  
 Riggs, President J. D. S., Ph.D., L.H.D.....Upper Alton, Ill.  
 Rowleson, Rev. C. C.....Iowa City, Iowa

Sage, Mr. John D.....Cincinnati, Ohio  
 Schwartz, Rev. Albert.....Clinton, Ill.  
 Skevington, Rev. Samuel J.....Newark, N. J.  
 Slater, Professor John R.....Rochester, N. Y.  
 Sloper, Mr. A. J.....New Britain, Conn.  
 Smith, Professor Gerald B.....Chicago, Ill.  
 Smith, Prof. J. M. P.....Chicago, Ill.  
 Stetson, H. L., D.D.....Kalamazoo, Mich.  
 Stevens, Professor W. A., D.D.....Rochester, N. Y.  
 Sweet, Rev. F. W.....Adrian, Mich.  
 Swift, Mr. George H.....Fulton, Mo.

Taylor, President J. M., LL.D.....Poughkeepsie, N. Y.  
 Thomson, Hon. D. E., K.C.....Toronto, Canada  
 Thresher, Mr. Albert.....Dayton, Ohio  
 Trout, Mr. W. H.....Milwaukee, Wis.

Van Arsdale, Rev. G. B.....Cedar Rapids, Iowa  
 Vander Roest, Mr. William.....Pelham, N. Y.  
 Van Kirk, Rev. J. M.....Kinross, Iowa  
 Vosburgh, G. B., D.D.....Denver, Colo.  
 Vose, Rev. Riley A.....Owego, N. Y.

Waite, Rev. Claire L.....Milwaukee, Wis.  
 Wallace, W. B., D.D.....Cleveland, Ohio  
 Waterman, Professor L.....Hillsdale, Mich.  
 Watson, Charles H., D.D.....Arlington, Mass.  
 Whidden, Howard P., D.D.....Dayton, Ohio  
 White, C. L., D.D.....New York City  
 Whitman, B.L., D.D.....Seattle, Wash.  
 Whitney, Geo. C.....Worcester, Mass.  
 Willett, Herbert L., D.D.....Chicago, Ill.  
 Williams, Professor C. L.....Granville, Ohio  
 Williams, Hannah J.....Bridgeport, Conn.  
 Williams, Mr. Morney.....New York City  
 Woods, Rev. F. C.....Baltimore, Md.  
 Woods, Rev. J. R.....Mason, Neb.  
 Wright, Rev. P. J.....Minneapolis, Minn.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BAPTIST CONGRESS, 1908  
FIRST DAY

*Afternoon Session*

MEMORIAL CHURCH OF CHRIST, CHICAGO, ILL.

Tuesday, November 10, 1908

2:30 o'clock P. M.

PROFESSOR HERBERT L. WILLETT, PH.D.; Will you turn to No. 822 in the Hymnal and sing a stanza or two of "My Faith Looks up to Thee"?

(The Congress then joined in song)

PROFESSOR WILLETT: *Members of the Congress:* In behalf of my colleague in the pastorate of this church, and the members of Memorial Church of Christ, and in behalf of the local committee, I can bid each of you a most cordial welcome to the sessions of the gathering.

I have pleasure in presenting to you the President of the Congress, Dr. John L. Jackson, of the Hyde Park Baptist Church, who will now preside.

REV. DR. JOHN L. JACKSON: I consider it a great honor to be invited to preside over the deliberations of this Congress. This is quite likely to be a historic assembly; at least, it is very significant that we have here the representatives of three denominations who have come together that they might know each other better, come into closer fellowship with each other and study together some of these fundamental problems of our common religion.

I can assure you that this programme which we have before us, which has been so carefully prepared by the committee, will afford you a rich feast of good things.

I will now call upon Brother A. B. Philputt, of Indianapolis, to lead us in prayer.

## (PRAYER)

REV. ALLAN B. PHILPUTT: We thank thee, our Heavenly Father, for the great good fellowship of this hour and of this Congress, and we pray thee that with open minds we may face the problems that meet us in our daily life and work in the Master's cause. We pray thee that our hearts may have safe anchorage in Jesus Christ, our Savior, thy Son, who came to open the way of life for us and that we may dwell together here, not as brethren of separate communes, but as of one family of God.

We pray thee to bless all the churches represented here; we pray thee to bless thy church universal. May we with teachable hearts come to thy work, come daily to thy work and to the throne of grace for wisdom and for guidance. And we pray thee that thy people everywhere may come to see, eye to eye, in the great things that belong to the Kingdom of God.

We pray thee that sweetness and light may be the temper of our minds and of all Christian minds, that we may be patient with differences, and that we may seize the great essential things of unity which really do hold us all and by which we are one church, one people, striving for the bringing in of the reign of Jesus Christ on earth.

And we pray that brotherly love and the spirit of prayer and the spirit of earnest endeavor may mark us all now and always in our Christian service through Jesus Christ, our Lord. *Amen.*

PRESIDENT JACKSON: According to the custom of this Congress, at this time the Secretary reads the rules of order. We will hear from Dr. Gessler.

DR. THEO. A. K. GESSLER then read the Rules of Discussion, and added:

Being on the floor I avail myself of this moment for an announcement. It is desired that all persons present, interested in the discussion of the question of the continuance of joint sessions or of a closer drawing together of the religious bodies represented in this Congress at this session, shall meet in the lecture-room immediately after the close of the present session.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We are now prepared to take up the general topic presented to us for the afternoon. The theme is, "Does the New Testament Contemplate the Church as an Institution?" The first writer is Professor John H. Logan, Ph.D.,

Hamilton, New York. Will Mr. Logan please step forward and take the platform?

PROFESSOR JOHN H. LOGAN, PH.D. (Baptist), Hamilton, N. Y., then presented the following paper:

### DOES THE NEW TESTAMENT CONTEMPLATE THE CHURCH AS AN INSTITUTION?

We are to discuss for twenty-five minutes the question, "Does the New Testament Contemplate the Church as an Institution?" Our first task will evidently be to interpret the question clearly. After some correspondence with the Secretary of the Congress on the subject, I have decided that the committee probably wished to have discussed the question, Was that body which was usually designated in the New Testament by the word *ἐκκλησία* consciously organized as an institution—i. e., did the founders intend that the organization called by this name should be a permanent thing, without essential changes in its character to go on forever? If this is not the meaning, there is not much meaning to the question, for, of course, there is such a thing recognized in the New Testament as a church. They were scattered all over Palestine and, in fact, all over the world before the end of New Testament times. Did those who established them intend them as a permanent order of things, or were they meant simply to meet the exigencies of the situation at that time? Our difficulty is not in finding the general use of the word, for that is perfectly clear; nor in knowing how much new meaning the apostles and New Testament writers attached to it; nor yet in determining what led the apostles to organize a distinctively Christian *ἐκκλησία*; but in deciding whether or not these men, in establishing an organization purely Christian, were consciously doing something that would entirely divorce them from Judaism and remain a distinct community, organized upon certain and unchangeable principles; for this is what we mean by the church as an institution. If we find an institution, it had a certain unity and rested upon certainly defined offices, institutions, laws, beliefs—for nothing else would be an institution.

The question looks easy enough to one who has not thought about it; to the New Testament scholar it proves to be very diffi-

cult, for it involves every great question of New Testament scholarship—history, exegesis, introduction, even textual criticism.

Without attempting a learned examination of the word itself—with a good lexicon, Greek, English, and Hebrew concordances, and the Bible, including Hebrew, Septuagint, and New Testament Greek, anyone can satisfy himself on this point—a few remarks will be necessary: (1) In the classics the word is a very democratic term. It means “an assembly of the citizens regularly summoned,” often “legislative assembly.” (2) It is used in the Septuagint to translate one or more Hebrew words which meant “congregation,” “assembly,” and in a restricted sense, the “congregation of Israel”—the whole congregation, which was the special people of God. The principal word for which our term stands may often be translated by “people of God.” (3) It comes into the New Testament, of course, through the Septuagint, and as it was the general term of the Septuagint for “the called of God,” i. e., for the assembly of God’s chosen people, it is naturally used in the New Testament to designate those whom the writers consider God’s chosen people, i. e., the Christians. Now it is used in the New Testament in all the senses in which it is known, either in classical Greek or the Septuagint (*vide* Concordance). As a term for our word church, it has the various meanings of a local body in a town or country, of the whole number of Christians of a country, of the “saved of God,” of “believers,” of “Christianity,” etc. It more frequently, perhaps, refers to local communities. But we very frequently attach a meaning to the word church that is not included in the New Testament term.

So far as Jesus is concerned, the concept of church, in our sense of the word, was entirely unknown to him. He neither founded it nor intended to found it, but it came as a natural result of his teachings. The one idea to which he directed his teaching was that of the Kingdom of God. John the Baptist’s message was: “The Kingdom of God is at hand,” by which he meant: “The long expected and desired political and religious revolution is a thing of the immediate future. The rulers of this world shall be dethroned and God’s chosen people shall receive the Kingdom.” The King would come immediately and establish it. Jesus began with the

same message. The Kingdom was at hand, and he was the King's son come to establish it on earth. But he preached as a son of Israel, and went about to save what could be saved of the national hopes and ideals. He is their Messiah. He went to John for baptism, which meant to him the sealing of his resolution to devote himself to a new sort of life. The temptation follows naturally upon this; it was a temptation to turn finally away from his determination to devote himself to the work of establishing the Kingdom of God and give himself to foolish attempts at political reform and greatness. Here he thought out the Sermon on the Mount, a sort of platform for his Kingdom campaign. In his Kingdom messages we have all that he thought about a church. The Kingdom of God cannot be scientifically defined; his ideas are not clear or harmonious enough for us to say he meant this or that. He left definition to the scribes, and contented himself by saying, "It is like." If we wanted to define Jesus' thought of the Kingdom we would have to say something like this: His mind was always especially full of the Psalms. His thought was set on the full establishing of that relation between God and his chosen people Israel which God had said should some day exist—when Israel should have no other thought than that of serving him. Jesus wanted to bring God and Israel together—to see realized in the nation all that God wanted his people to be. His whole heart was wrapped up with the thought that he was something to Israel that Israel deeply needed, that his Kingdom was the highest good. Just when his messianic consciousness began to develop, and just what it was, we cannot say for certain; it is probable that it was not always entirely clear to himself. Any attempt to explain it by saying that he was a child of his time, with all the notions then current, must fail, because it is far short of the whole truth. His messianic consciousness was unique, superhuman. His ideas were on the whole immeasurably higher than those of the most spiritual Jews of the age in which he lived. The Temptation story shows that at the very beginning he put under his feet for all time the ordinary current view of the Kingdom of God. Sometimes the Kingdom is looked upon as already present, at other times as deferred to the future; but it was always either present or im-



mediately at hand. One thing certain, however: after making due allowance for all the later interpretations that find expression in the gospels, we are forced to the conclusion that he considered himself as the Messiah and that he expected at the last to come on the clouds and set up the Kingdom of God and rule over it as its king. He neither knew the exact time, nor did he encourage the disciples to indulge their curiosity as to the time. His whole message was: "It's coming; be always ready." His whole thought was to be about his Father's business while it was day. He was always conscious of the immediate presence of God in his life, and he wanted his disciples to feel this nearness to God, this complete mastery of God over their whole life. This *was* the Kingdom of God: doing the will of God and living in fellowship with God. But this does not mean that the Kingdom was, in his mind, an indefinite, abstract concept; his parable teaching shows plainly that it was looked upon as a real, concrete thing, a thing that can be seen, a community, a nation, acting out the principles of God's righteousness and of loving fellowship and brotherhood—a redeemed and regenerated society. It was to come on earth, and men were to get into it and seek to make its principles universal. Nothing was more real. It was to have a king and laws—not in the sense of enactments, but laws in the sense of law of cause and effect, for example. In this sense two laws were prescribed by him: love and service. In his Kingdom these would be carried out perfectly, for the subjects of the Kingdom would be perfect. Was there any concept of church in all this? Matthew puts the word into his mouth twice, and it is not attributed to him elsewhere. It is difficult to say whether these were the words of Jesus or merely those of the writer who is reporting his discourse. Much can be said on both sides, but I take it that they belong to Jesus. The next difficulty lies in establishing their meaning. The only sound method of interpretation must seek to harmonize them with Jesus' constant and general thought. The first of these passages is Matt. 16:18, where, in answer to Peter's declaration of faith in Jesus as the Messiah, Jesus answered: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I shall build my church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail

against it." It is significant that in the same breath he uses that other expression which is so common in his mouth:

The author's MS omits the expression to which reference is made.

—SECRETARY

The close connection naturally suggests the question whether the two expressions were not identical. It seems to me that they were. (Thayer thinks that Jesus probably said βασιλεία instead of ἐκκλησία.) Jesus was simply comparing his future people to a building (a common but figurative use of οἰκοδομέω), and he declared that this building would be as strong as the gates of Hades—a great stronghold. From the very figure which he uses it was indicated that the future church was to be built according to some definite plan. The remainder of the passage bears this out. Now Jesus probably spoke Aramaic, in which case he used an Aramaic expression. This put him back a little nearer the Hebrew word **בְּנֵי**, which was translated in the Septuagint by ἐκκλησία. I can imagine him sitting there, with his eyes down in a thoughtful attitude, after Peter had declared him to be the Son of God, the Messiah, i. e., the leader and builder of the Kingdom of God as it had been foretold by the prophets of Israel. After a pause he looks up and says: "That's it, Peter. God has revealed the truth to you. Yes, I am the Messiah and I am going to build a new **בְּנֵי** of Israel; it shall incorporate my principles and include my new Israel, reformed and redeemed. I am going to build it upon you, and as you are a 'rock,' so shall my Kingdom be as strong as the stone gate of Hades. The old Israel shall be regenerated upon this great truth that you have uttered, and because you have seen it and expressed it, you shall be the foundation stone of the new Israel, of *my* Israel." As Jesus used the word, he had in mind not so much an institution, an organization—though this is possibly implied—as a community of brothers, bound together with the common tie of interest in and striving for the coming of the Kingdom—a brotherhood of the redeemed. He left it to the future to organize, to build an institution, if it should seem necessary. It was a poetic dream, a glorious vision not long before his earthly career was over; his church was to be the community, the brotherhood, of those who were to share in the work of bringing about what he taught them

to pray for in the Lord's prayer. Hence the term is here used in an abstract sense. (In all the English versions up to 1572—the revision of the "Bishop's Bible"—the word was translated "congregation.")

The reference in Matt., chap. 18, is in the same spirit, though an organized community is assumed. There is absolutely no objection to the theory that Jesus had in mind the Jewish "congregation," for the organization implied is completely in harmony with that of the Jewish congregation, but he meant the Jewish church of the future, the regenerated church, the church which should embody the principles of the Kingdom doctrines—i. e., of love and service, for the whole question here is as to the extent to which love serves an erring brother. That he had in mind a purely Jewish idea is clear from the context: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." There was a Jewish saying current at the time: "Where two are met and engaged in talking about the law (of God), God dwells with them." Further, that he was talking about his Kingdom is perfectly clear from the whole context. Of course, there is also no objection to taking the word here in its original sense and referring it then to the congregation of those who should confess Jesus as the Messiah, and this again would make it identical with the Kingdom: as soon as there are *two* who have the right attitude to him, there is the Kingdom, or the church, in the sense in which Jesus used the expression. Now this is in complete harmony with Paul's use of the terms Kingdom of God and Church of Christ. In the earlier epistles—Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Thessalonians—the prevailing use of *ἐκκλησία* is in reference to the local body; in Ephesians and Colossians, its use is that of "body of Christ," "universal brotherhood," etc., in which sense the word *βασιλεία* as used by Jesus might be appropriately used. It is true that Paul generally uses *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ* for the future kingdom, but this, again, corresponds to Jesus' use of the term, in which the Kingdom is sometimes looked upon as present, at other times as future.

But while Jesus certainly did not organize a church in any sense, or indicate that such would be done in the future, his preaching made this step a necessity for the future. He did

organize, in a way, a little band, which he called his "flock," "sheep." He described in figures his relation to his "flock;" *he* was the vine, they the branches, the Father the vine-dresser. He did not, in general, limit his teachings to this band; others shared in them, and followed him (Acts 1:15, 21). This band, called the *μαθηταί*, remained with him, after the manner of John's disciples or Elijah's. He appointed them to a share in his work and privileges, and recognized them as his most intimate associates in all things, and he was untiring in his efforts to give them the specific preparation necessary for planting and spreading the work of the Kingdom. This band was the organized Kingdom; to it he gave the keys, and the Kingdom was to live in it. As to a church in anything like our sense, the Kingdom idea of Jesus was entirely too large to harmonize with it. The very work of the Kingdom implies the necessity for organization, but no plan of organization was included, much less details. He broke away from the Jewish church, and Matt. 16:18 may imply that he saw the necessity of a formal break with it; but in doing so he left nothing to take its place, except a brotherhood, a fellowship of men. He spoke of his "family"—those who do the will of God, but this excludes the idea of *doing* things prescribed by men, and represents only an inner attitude to God. What he really contributed was personality, undying words, and deeds. He fully believed that the end of the age was near, but his significance does not in any way depend upon this view, for his message was not primarily, "The end will soon be here, therefore be prepared," but, "Be always prepared;" and the preparation which he urged struck at the very heart and center of all true religion and ethics. It was a note of eternity, suited to all times and conditions. Jesus was far too iconoclastic in his attitude to customs, organizations, and even to the Jewish church, to set up a new church with laws, ordinances, etc., and any directions that he might have given for organizing, however simple, would have become in the hands of his disciples as absolute as the Jewish ceremonial law was for the Jews. In his Kingdom teaching there is an entire lack of laws, rules, ordinances, etc. We have only great moral principles, meant to reform individuals and raise them to fellowship with God. He meant that his little band should get hold

of the divine life and hold it fast, without laws to bind them down. He filled them so full of himself and of God that they were caught up by a holy enthusiasm and swayed by it for several generations, so that in spite of their limitations and misconceptions they laid eternal foundations. Thus in his simplicity was his greatness—no laws but only principles, and principles that poured into all life moral and religious values. It was his person and his mission that gave new values to life and raised him high above all mortals. He looms up grander and mightier with the decades and the centuries. His disciples thought that he was the Jewish Messiah and that he would soon return upon the clouds and assert his rights. He had left this impression upon them, for this remained his own view till the very end. He said to his judges: "You will see *me* again." When he saw a quick death before him, it was too late to form a definite plan for the future and all that he had to say was: "Wait till you hear from me; I will send the Spirit." And thus he left them, and thus he stood and stands as the everlasting rock, whose lofty summit is lifted high above the nights and the winters and the storms. He professed no new religion, but went down beneath the surface and deepened the meaning of the old. His constant charge against Pharisaism, which had monopolized the Jewish church, was: "You have miserably failed in your duty. You had the Kingdom, but it shall be taken from you;" but he tried to save Israel and preserve it in its possession of the Kingdom. In refusing to accept the scribal interpretations of the law, he struck a death-blow to Judaism. In Matt., chap. 5, he puts himself above Moses and all the teachers. The whole tenor of the Sermon on the Mount makes a final separation from Judaism necessary, for there was too much in it that could never be accepted by the leaders. There was no chance from the beginning for its acceptance; and if it was not to be lost, there must be a new organization for its preservation.

At the Ascension of Jesus two things were necessary before we have a church: the idea of a church, and its realization in an organization. Now at first, and for several years, there could be no idea of a church as a permanent institution, for the disciples had only one thought—the early appearing of their risen Lord.

But they were themselves the nucleus of a future church—nothing more. All that remained of Christianity were the impressions which were buried in their hearts, and the fact that Jesus was alive again. They had asked him when he appeared to them: "Dost Thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" They asked this question because it was uppermost in their minds and because it had been the burden of his conversation with them after the resurrection (Acts, chap. 1). They were altogether in the dark in regard to the future. They had no plans. He had none, so all he could say was: "Wait till the Spirit comes." "Wait for future developments." This is the meaning of Paul's claim, upon which he based his apostleship, that Christ appeared to him and that still later he had seen into the third heaven—Paul had received further instructions even after the baptism of the Spirit at Pentecost. So Christ's Spirit continued to guide the apostles as to what steps to take. Their proceeding before Pentecost was the same as after: they met every day for prayer and consultation, usually in a private house. All they were decided upon was that they were not going to give up. They proceeded to close up their broken lines by electing one to take the place of Judas. They were getting ready for business. Now comes Pentecost and the discourse of Peter to the multitude which had been attracted by the unusual scene. The little company of disciples receives large additions, and the new converts join in the work of spreading the good news. For several years their meetings continue to be held principally in private houses, and probably for the most part in secret; but they continue also to visit the temple and the synagogues, taking part in the worship, just as in Jesus' time; and, as in his case, an important part of their work was the healing of the sick and preaching to those attracted by their miracles. After a time the scribes became alarmed or annoyed that this little company was growing so rapidly, and some arrests were made, but no severe punishment was meted out to them. We know little as to what classes supplied the converts; there were said to be many priests, and there were certainly many poor, some rich, and some few men of prominence. The most that can be said of them was that they were a society, held together by their common hope, and living in

a spirit of the most self-sacrificing brotherly love. It was a family of believers. There seems to have been no effort to extend the Kingdom outside of Jerusalem until persecution drove many of the disciples from the city to their homes in neighboring provinces. Even then the apostles remained in Jerusalem for some time. Finally, hearing of successful work done in other parts by the dispersed believers, they sent Peter and John to oversee and assist in what was being done. There was a general period of prosperity wherever the good news was preached, and sometime during this period Saul was converted. Then comes the record of his mighty missionary activity which resulted during the next twenty or thirty years in the establishing of churches practically all over the world. To these churches and to his converts Paul wrote numerous letters from various places, almost until his death. What were these churches like? The first thing that strikes us in the Acts account is the comparative seldomness with which the word *ἐκκλησία* occurs, even in accounts of very important events. In most cases where it does occur, it is simply a word used by a writer at a much later date, when it was so common that he never takes the pains to tell us what he means by it. There is no hint that it was common in the period which he is describing, and he does not attribute its use to the early disciples themselves. If we look up the passages in which he uses it, we see at once that one of several other words might appropriately be substituted for it; e. g., its first occurrence in 1:11: "Great fear came upon the church"—no organization is referred to, and "brotherhood" would be more appropriate. The next reference, 8:1, 3, refers to the "believers"—a better word than church. This is clear from vs. 3: "Paul laid waste the whole church—entering *into every house*;" 9:31: "The church throughout all Judea, Galilee, and Samaria had peace,"—i. e., the "believers;" 11:22 refers to the local congregation in Jerusalem—it is the best word we could use here; 11:26: we must go back to the idea of "brotherhood" assembled; Paul and Barnabas met regularly with the disciples of Antioch, who, like those of Jerusalem in earlier times, were accustomed to meet for worship and who were consequently on such occasions an assembly of Christians; 12:1: "Herod put forth his hand to afflict certain of the church"—i. e.,

some prominent "believers"—nothing more. In 15:3, 4, "church" is out of place, "faithful," "brethren," were better; 20:28 refers to the "Christian cause," the church universal, as we would say. It is needless to go farther. The word is used for the most part in a very broad sense by the author, and in most cases another word—"believers," "faithful," "followers of Jesus," "gathering"—would be more appropriate. It occurs in only two chapters before the ninth chapter, and after the ninth chapter the word ἀδελφοί is used much more frequently to designate the same general concept (9:30; 10:23; 11:1, 12, 29; 12:17; 14:2; 15:1, 3, 22, 23; 16:2, 40; 17:6, 10, 18; 18:18, 29, etc.). ἀδελφοί is also used frequently by Paul in exactly the same sense in which he uses ἐκκλησία (but sometimes with this difference, that the one looks to the individuals, while the other refers to the community as a whole—in both Acts and Paul). The word μαθηταί also occurs frequently in Acts in the same sense as ἐκκλησία (6:1, 2, 7; 9:1, 19, 26, 38).

From all that has been said we must conclude that no constructive statement concerning the church of the apostles can be made that does not take into account two things: first, these men were Jews, striving to maintain all the important elements of Judaism; secondly, all they did was under the influence of the hope of the early reappearance of the Messiah (παρουσία was the coming—not second coming, for they did not think of a second coming). Their preaching was, with unimportant exceptions, to the Jews whom they hoped to convert. As many, including a considerable number of the priests, had been converted very early, their hope is easily understood. Failing in this and finding the synagogues well adapted to their needs—and knowing nothing else—they began slowly to establish a Christian synagogue. (The words, synagogue and church were often interchangeably used in the LXX, and in the Epistle of James the Christian assembly is called a synagogue.) In the course of a few years when they began to see that the great body of the people were not going to be converted they began to call their assembly the "Church of God," by which they set up the claim that they were the only true Israel. Their use of the Old Testament as their guide in all things shows that they had no notion of founding



anything new, they were merely the continuers of the old. God had clearly recognized this by raising Jesus from the dead. They continued to proclaim in the synagogues, when allowed to speak therein, "Brethren, we have a new light: Jesus the crucified is alive. He is the Messiah and he is coming soon to set up the long-promised Kingdom. In order to share in it you must become his disciples." In their little assemblies, patterned in every way after the synagogue (*vide* Schürer, s. v. "Synagogue"), they did not exclude the Jewish ceremonies, but a new something, a hero-worship, absorbed their attention. Now these assemblies date back to within a few years of Pentecost, and they may have been called "churches" from the very beginning, but if so the word meant no more than "meeting," "band," fellowship"—not even "assembly" could properly be applied to it, for there was either no organization or, at most, a very imperfect one. They were a "society," but without constitution or by-laws. Three things characterize them: belief in Jesus the Messiah, baptism, the "breaking of bread." Without the intention of forming a church those who accepted Jesus had to separate themselves from the Jews and form societies of their own where they could find sympathy. And so wherever they found acceptance they set up the so-called churches in private houses. Baptism and the "breaking of bread" in no way imply an organization. John baptized but he did not organize a church. Baptism at first meant only that the believer was thus made a disciple. They met very often and broke bread every time they assembled, but it was no more than an expression of their brotherly love and common hope (a Jewish custom; *vide* Schürer).

So long as the expectation that Jesus was soon to appear was uppermost in their minds, there was neither need nor possibility of a church as an institution. This explains the slow and unconscious development of a church, as well as the entire absence from our authorities of a "doctrine" of a church. They had no doctrine, no ecclesiastical formulas. The fact that they had some organization—deacons, elders (the word "bishop" occurs only once in Acts and there Luke puts it in the mouth of Paul)—does not show that it was looked upon as a permanent thing. It was copied from the synagogue and the very confusion as to the

significance of these offices shows the lack of a definite plan of organization. This does not mean, of course, that everything was left to chance, but only to expediency and necessity. Not until long after the apostolic age did the church organization take anything like a permanent or final form, and had the apostles lived forty years longer it is impossible to tell what final form it would have taken under them.

Not until Paul do we have a *concept* of church. He was the real founder of the Christian church as an institution—not that he left it as such, but that he molded the sentiment for it and left a finished concept of it. Of course, we have to distinguish in his letters between the local assemblies, in regard to which he in no way departed from the other apostles, except perhaps by improving a little on the organization, without, however, drawing any permanent plan of organization, and the church as the universal brotherhood of believers. He begins to formulate a dogma of the church, due partly to the fact that the whole task of making Christianity acceptable to the gentiles, its future possessors, fell upon him, and partly to his christology. In preserving Christianity to the gentiles, he had to differentiate the church sharply from Judaism. There were, of course, numerous matters of organization, cult, etc., to be settled; hence in his earlier epistles, especially in I Cor., we have numerous references to them, but even here many important matters of organization are left untouched, due to the fact that he had no well-assembled ecclesiastical system. It is not even certain that he recognized any regular ministry (e. g., he uses the word *ἐπίσκοπος* only once and *πρεσβύτερος* not once in all his epistles to churches). However, baptism and the “breaking of bread” become fixed. The former is given a spiritual interpretation, the latter becomes a technical expression for the “Lord’s Supper.”

As to the church in general, he regards it, just as the apostles had regarded themselves, as the “True Israel,” in distinction from the “Israel after the Flesh” (I Cor. 10:18; Gal. 6:14). It has superseded the Jewish church as the vehicle of inspiration (Eph. 3:5). It is the only institution that can have direct communion with God. With Christ “all things have become new.” “Christ is the end of the law.” Hence we have completed that differentia-

tion between the old and the new that had gradually been going on from the time of John the Baptist. Paul sets up Christ in opposition to the law, above it, whereas the other apostles made him harmonize with the law in every point, which corresponds also with Jesus' way of thinking. With him Christianity is entirely distinct from and independent of Judaism; hence the church is also divorced from it and it rises to the dignity of a Christian institution. It is the body of Christ, the temple of God, the bride of Christ (II Cor. 11:2). These figures show that the church has an organic union with Christ and confirm the general conception of Paul that without the church there is no salvation. All the apostles believed that baptism was necessary to salvation. But we must get their view. Paul's general use of the word church makes it practically identical with our word Christianity, or perhaps better with Jesus' use of the term, "Kingdom of God." With the other apostles there was no such thing as the anomalous person who accepted Christ without at the same time becoming his disciple. The very fact of believing included baptism; belief, baptism, and the other Christian practices being so closely united in their minds that they could not think of them as being separate acts. The word "Church" in Ephesians and Colossians, especially, is exactly equal to the expression "belief in Christ."

Our authority for churches does not come alone from the New Testament. We who know Jesus Christ, the Savior of men and the King of heaven, have, aside from the New Testament, all the authority we need for any organization necessary to express our faith and accomplish our work. We need no other authority than the mind of Jesus which is in us, together with the need and the privilege. This is the only authority the apostles had, and they desired no more. On this authority they organized and established little self-governing bodies wherever they could find disciples, calling them churches. Paul did the same thing. Both he and the author of Acts tell us something about it, but we would know it even if they had said nothing as to organization, for it was but common-sense to organize those whom he had converted. Another thing: practically it makes not the slightest difference to us that the apostles looked for the early advent of Jesus to set up the Kingdom. They certainly intended

that their churches should exist till his coming, and this is exactly what we think about the church of today. We need not feel bound to have the same organization in detail that they had. Besides, this is impossible for we do not know enough about the internal organization even of the churches of Antioch and Corinth as to which we are best informed. What they wanted is what we want—that “the kingdom of the world” shall become “the Kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ.”

PRESIDENT JACKSON: The second writer on this theme is Rev. A. W. Fortune, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Dr. Fortune will take the platform.

REV. A. W. FORTUNE (Disciple), Cincinnati, Ohio, read as follows:

#### DOES THE NEW TESTAMENT CONTEMPLATE THE CHURCH AS AN INSTITUTION?

Every Christian is vitally interested in the answer to this question, Did Jesus or the apostles organize the church as an institution? If they did found such an institution, did it have the definiteness which would indicate that they intended that it should remain, as they left it, for all time? Or did Jesus merely plant the germ, which developed under the guidance of the apostles as circumstances directed, and has continued to develop down to our own time?

For the study of a question, like this, which concerns our religious belief, there is need of an open and unprejudiced mind. Although some of the churches of today are widely different, yet they practically all claim to be conformed to the New Testament pattern. To get a correct picture of the New Testament church, we must abandon the thought that we are to find a church like our own. The one aim must be to find out what the New Testament actually teaches.

#### WHAT IS MEANT BY THE CHURCH AS AN INSTITUTION?

Ἐκκλησία is from ἐκκλητος, “called out,” and primarily means “a gathering of citizens called out from their homes into some public place,” or an assembly. Among the Greeks ἐκκλησία was used to mean an assembly of the people convened at the public

place of council for the purpose of deliberating. It is so used in Acts 19:39. In the Septuagint it is often equivalent to *ἐκκλησία* the assembly of the Israelites. It is used in this sense in Acts 7:38 and Heb. 2:12. This term, which was well known both to Jews and to Greeks, was used to designate the Christian community.

At the close of the second century the Christian *ἐκκλησία* had manifestly become institutionalized. There were orderly officials, who spake according to their office, and not as they were prompted by the spirit. Ordination was not a recognition of grace bestowed by God, but was itself a communication of grace. A single bishop was at the head of the church, and there were presbyters who were subordinate to him. Baptism and the Lord's Supper were church ordinances, and they were administered by the bishop or by those to whom he gave authority. To be in communion with God one must be in fellowship with the church. The church of the second century had its "rule of faith" which one must believe to become a member. Much stress was placed upon apostolic doctrine. The organization and creed of the church were believed to be apostolic and hence authoritative. One must be a part of the church to have the Spirit of God. "Where the church is," said Irenaeus, "there is the Spirit of God."<sup>1</sup> At the close of the second century Christianity was institutionalized. Does the New Testament contemplate the church as an institution in some such sense, or does it use the term *ἐκκλησία* in a loose sense, as designating those who are bound together by a common belief in Christ, and by a common purpose to win others to this belief?

In this paper no attempt will be made at a critical study of the documents. What is sought is a picture of the church as it is given in the New Testament as we have it. But really to understand what the New Testament church was, the study must, in a measure at least, be historical. Hence this paper will treat the subject under the following heads: the church in the teaching of Jesus; the church in the Book of Acts; the church in the writings of Paul; and the church in the other New Testament writings.

<sup>1</sup> Iren., III, chap. xxiv.

1. *The church in the teaching of Jesus.*—The word *ἐκκλησία* occurs only twice in the gospels. Once it refers to something that is future, and in the other instance there is reflected a very simple condition. The Fourth Gospel, which is a very late document, says nothing at all about the church. It places all emphasis on the Kingdom of God.

The first reference in the teaching of Jesus to the church is in Matt. 16:18. This was after the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi. In reply to this confession Jesus said: "And I also say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it." *ἐκκλησία* was a term that was well known to the Jews. It had been used to designate the assembly of the congregation of Israel. And while the disciples were upon this high peak of faith Jesus told them that he would be rejected from the assembly of Israel, and that he would establish a community of his own followers.

The other reference to the church in the teaching of Jesus is in Matt. 18:15-20. This is in regard to the treatment of an offending brother. The organization reflected in this passage is the simplest possible. It is a community of brethren without any official head. Discipline was the function of all the members of the community. In case of offense there was to be first a private conference. If that was of no avail there was to be another conference in the presence of two or three witnesses. If the guilty party did not respect their judgment the difficulty was to be presented to the whole community. If the offender still refused to acknowledge his fault, he was to be treated as a gentile and a publican. That is, he was to be self-excluded from their fellowship.

Jesus did not organize an *ἐκκλησία* as an institution. He called a number of personal followers about him. The name used to designate these followers was *μαθηταί*. These men who were gathered about him and traveled with him were his pupils. Early in his ministry Jesus called about him the Twelve. These were his immediate companions. He instructed them and they became his helpers. Later he sent out the Seventy. Jesus inspired his disciples with love and service, but he left them to

express their life as circumstances might lead them. Jesus organized no ἐκκλησία. He formulated no constitution, appointed no officers, prescribed no rules. He left the life to create its own ecclesiastical organization.

When Jesus called the first disciples the Christian community had its beginning. The terms of fellowship were simple. There was no doctrinal test. The personality of Jesus was the center around which the community was formed. The progress of the development of the Christian community under Jesus stopped with the calling of personal followers about him; with the vesting of the exercising of discipline in the whole community; and with the appointment of a custodian of the funds of the society. Jesus, however, did imply that his disciples should constitute themselves into a more definite ἐκκλησία. But he left no instructions as to its organization. Under the guidance of his spirit, his followers were to work out the details to meet the growing and changing wants of the community.

According to all the synoptists, as well as the apostle Paul, Jesus instituted a supper which his disciples were to keep in memory of him. And according to the great commission, Jesus told his disciples to administer the ordinance of baptism. Although the idea of fellowship is necessarily present in both of these ordinances, yet there is no indication that Jesus gave them as church ordinances. The one was simply a memorial which was to be kept in memory of him, and the other was the continuation of an ordinance which had been practiced since the days of John the Baptist, and was well known to the Jews even before his time.

2. *The church in the Book of Acts.*—We have found that the church did not exist as an institution in the time of Jesus. As we study the writings of the church Fathers from Cyprian back to the time of the apostles we observe a constant development. It would not be strange if the same development should have continued back to the time of Jesus himself. A careful study of the Book of Acts, which is a history of the early Christian community, reveals the fact that there was such a development in the apostolic ἐκκλησία.

Ἐκκλησία is used in Acts to designate the Christian community

in a particular place, like Jerusalem or Antioch. It is used in the plural to designate a number of churches in a province (16:5). It is also used in the singular to include all the believers (9:31).

The *ἐκκλησία* of the first part of Acts was evidently not an institution. It lacked all the elements of an institution. It was an inner group in the great Jewish *ἐκκλησία*. It had no organization. The first Christians were Jews and then Christians. They frequented the temple and the synagogues. They observed the Jewish hours of daily prayer, and the Jewish rite of circumcision. The early Christians met in private houses for fellowship and prayer and the Lord's Supper. The apostles had general oversight of everything.

The first notice of any organization within the local church is in the sixth chapter of Acts, when seven men were set apart to administer the charity of the community. No official title was given to these men and it is not known whether the office was continued and reproduced in other Christian communities. It has generally been held that this was the origin of the diaconate, but many scholars today question this view. Some even maintain that "the Seven" of the sixth chapter of Acts are the same as the "elders" of the eleventh chapter. This is not improbable, as the function of both seems to have been the same. As the church was confronted by new needs it developed to meet these needs, and it developed along lines with which the people were already familiar. The church was planted on Jewish soil, and as it took shape it was undoubtedly influenced by the organization and worship of the synagogue. In the selection of "the Seven" three elements are observed as regards the Christian community. It was under apostolic guidance. The community was independent. And a representative system of administration was suggested by the surroundings of the people. The apostles were the administrators of the Jerusalem community until it became so large that it took too much of their time. Then they decided to give themselves to the ministry of the Word, and to have seven men selected by the community to administer the temporal affairs. The number seven was undoubtedly suggested by the fact that the Jewish village was ruled by the council of the seven.



In Acts 11:30 we meet for the first time the elders of the church. They are mentioned in connection with the relief which was sent by the disciples of Antioch to the church in Jerusalem. The writer does not say anything about the origin of this office, or even of its function. He simply mentions the elders as being the ones in the Jerusalem church to whom relief was sent. Had the writer of the Book of Acts considered the elders a necessary part of the church, he would doubtless have been more explicit in his statements in regard to them. In the fourteenth chapter of Acts we are told that Paul and Barnabas returned through the cities where they had preached and appointed elders in every church. The picture of the church as given in Acts up to this point is very simple. It is under the supervision of the apostles and, in most cases at least, there are elders to govern the local communities. These elders were doubtless patterned after the rulers of the synagogues. Just as upon the mission fields today, the selection of these elders, in the new communities built up by Paul and Barnabas, was determined largely by them. There are many references to the Christian *ἐκκλησία* up to this point, but the institutional element plays a small part. They are communities of brethren.

In the fifteenth chapter of Acts there is the first reference to any general organization of the church, and this shows that there was a lack of organization. The community at Antioch was troubled about the rite of circumcision, and "the brethren appointed that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question. . . . And when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received of the church and the apostles and the elders." The apostles and elders gathered together to consider the matter. Peter, who was still the pillar apostle, expressed his opinion in regard to the matter under discussion. James, who, perhaps because of his relation to Jesus, was leader of the church at Jerusalem, expressed his conviction in regard to the best course to pursue. "Then it seemed good to the apostles and the elders, with the whole church, to choose men out of their company and send them to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas." With them they also sent a letter. But this letter was not the enactment of an

ecclesiastical body, binding upon the whole church. It was a letter of fellowship and advice to brethren who had appealed for guidance in the settlement of a perplexing problem. This appeal had been made because this was the original church and most of the apostles were there. This did not claim to be an ecclesiastical body acting for the whole church, and Paul, in the second chapter of Galatians, denies them any such authority.

According to the picture that is given in the Book of Acts, the aim of all preaching was to get men to accept Christ as Savior, rather than to get them to become members of an ecclesiastical body. But the believers became an ἐκκλησία where they had fellowship and received help from one another. Anyone who believed in Christ and was baptized was considered a part of the ἐκκλησία. All of these were under supervision of the apostles, or missionaries, who founded them, but there were elders who had oversight of the local communities. And in the church at Jerusalem there was one man who seemed to be at the head of the elders, and this church with its elders and apostles had such prominence that they sent out men to investigate reports from distant Antioch, and the brethren at Antioch later appealed to them for a decision on the question of circumcision. Salvation through Christ is the chief thing in the Book of Acts. Fellowship of the brethren is also prominent, but ecclesiasticism has little place. Men are commanded to be baptized, but not that they may have membership in the church. Surprisingly little is said about the Lord's Supper, and nothing that would designate it as a church ordinance.

3. *The church in the writings of Paul.*—Paul used the term ἐκκλησία in several different senses. He used it to designate the body of believers in some particular place (I Thess. 1:14; I Cor. 1:1, 2). He used it to include a number of congregations (I Cor. 16:19). He used in the sense of the assembly of the local congregation (I Cor. 14:19, 35). He made use of it in the sense of the one universal church (Col. 1:18, 24; Eph. 1:22). And he also used it to mean the one universal church as being represented in the local church (Gal. 1:13).

Paul did not give explicit teaching on the organization of the church, and it is difficult from the many indirect references to

get a definite impression. In I Cor. 12:28 he said: "God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers," etc. In Eph. 4:11 he says. "And he gave some to be apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers." But these were not officials in the local community. They were appointed by God, by the peculiar gifts they possessed, to labor in the church in the broad sense. Paul sends greetings to the bishops and deacons of the church at Philippi (1:1), and he admonishes the Christians of Thessalonica to esteem them that are set over them (I Thess. 5:13). No reference is made to official leaders in his letters to the Galatians and Corinthians. The omission of these official titles does not prove that the church did not have these officers, but it does indicate that they did not represent the churches. Paul speaks to the whole church, and calls upon the whole church to act. Yet a community like that at Corinth could not exist without officials, and these were undoubtedly the elders and perhaps deacons. This community was much like a little self-governing republic. It had charge of discipline and of fraternal relations between the community and other Christian communities. Letters seeking apostolic advice were prepared and dispatched in its name. The church had power to expel unworthy members and it had power to restore the penitent. Paul even urged the Corinthian Christians to settle their own difficulties and not go before courts of law. While Paul recognized the apostles and prophets and teachers as being the most important, yet there were those in this local community who had the gift of government, and these were undoubtedly the elders.

In the pastoral epistles are given the qualifications of the elders and deacons. The qualifications of the deacons indicate that their function is serving, and the qualifications of the elders or bishops indicate that their function is ruling. The terms elder and bishop seem to be used interchangeably, and perhaps the first describes the man, and the second his function. This interchange of terms by Paul is in harmony with the other New Testament writers. The same officers in the Church at Ephesus are alternately called presbyters and bishops in Acts 20:17, 28. In I Pet. 5:1, 2, presbyters are urged to teach the flock of God and

to fulfil the office of bishop. This interchange of terms continued after apostolic times. (See Epistle of Clement, ad Cor., 42, 44; also Didache, chap. 15.)

I Tim. 5:17, 18, would almost indicate that there were some of the elders who were giving all their time to teaching and were being supported by the church. And it might seem, because the term bishop is in the singular in Titus 1:7, that this indicates that there was one who had been raised above the rest. It, however, seems more probable that the article here is generic. With the exception of these directions in the pastoral epistles to Timothy and Titus, Paul has little to say about the organization of the church. Lindsay says: "The apostle Paul sends greeting to persons of different sexes and positions in life, but never to office-bearers as such. Nor among his many exhortations does he allude to the need of organization under hierarchical authority. Still less does he prescribe a form of organization which was to be uniform throughout the whole church of Christ."

Paul speaks of the church as being one, but not in the sense of a uniform ecclesiastical organization. It is one because it is united to Christ. The church is the body of Christ. The churches of Paul's time were not organized into an outward unity. The local congregations which composed the church were far apart and there was but little connection between many of them. There was no central government which extended over them all, or even over those comprised within a given district. The unity was inner and spiritual. They shared a common truth and a common life. They all partook of the same spiritual food and drank of the same spiritual drink. The Church of Paul's time had to struggle with some serious problems, but notwithstanding these, it maintained this unity of spirit.

Pfleiderer said: "An organization of the church in the sense of an ecclesiastical institution, was not merely not given by Paul, but not even contemplated by him, for the simple reason that he expected the *παρουσία* of Christ in the near future." While Paul did more than any other man to give form to the church, yet it is evident that Paul placed but little stress on the church as an institution. The thing that concerned him was not one's relation to the church, but one's relation to Christ. He nowhere

tells how to become a member of the church, but the very center of his message is the way to become justified with God. It is true that Paul recognized the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper, and placed considerable emphasis upon them, but he did not emphasize them as church ordinances. Baptism, with Paul, symbolizes the bestowal of divine grace through union with Christ. According to Paul we are baptized into Christ rather than into the church. According to Paul baptism symbolizes the moral renewal. It symbolizes death to sin and resurrection to newness of life. With Paul the idea of fellowship is in the Lord's Supper, but the important feature is the memorial. Paul condemns the Corinthians, not so much for lack of fellowship as for lack of discerning the Lord's body. He speaks of the cup as being a communion, but it is "a communion of the blood of Christ." The thing of supreme importance to Paul was the life consecrated to Christ, and the church and its organization were of value only as it helped in this. It was not an end, but only a means to an end.

4. *The church in the other New Testament writings.*—The other New Testament writers furnish but little additional material in regard to the church. As already pointed out, in I Pet. 5:1, 2, the elders are admonished to tend the flock of God exercising the oversight. In this connection Peter calls himself a fellow-elder. In James the Christian assembly is called *συναγωγή* rather than *ἐκκλησία* but the sick are instructed to call for the elders of the church who shall pray over them. The Second Epistle of John purports to have been written by "the elder unto the elect lady and her children," and at the close there are greetings from "the children of thine elect sister." It is possible that the elect lady is the church but by no means certain. The Third Epistle of John purports to have been written by "the elder unto Gaius the beloved." These writers have nothing to say about the prophets and teachers and evangelists of which Paul spoke. Neither is there any mention of the deacons in their writings. There is no reference to the fact that one man has been placed over the presbyters in the control of the churches, unless the angel of the seven churches in Asia be so regarded which is quite improbable.

In a careful reading of these general letters one must be impressed with the little that is said about the church. They are exhortations to right living in view of the greatness of our calling. Much is said about false teachers, but these are not denounced as not accepting the teachings of the church. They are denounced as denying the Master himself and walking after their own lusts.

#### SUMMARY

The church in the time of Jesus was not an institution. The thing of supreme importance with him was the Kingdom of God. This was the center of his teaching. It was this for which he taught his disciples to pray. And it was this for which he gave up his life. The followers of Jesus naturally formed a community, but this was a secondary thing. The thing of vital interest with Jesus was to get men in right relation with God. The church was not an institution in the early days of its history, but as time passed, it more and more approached the institutional. The Christian community at first was a band of brethren of spiritual equality, without much formal organization. It was like a family. They met in private houses. Both spiritual and material matters were discussed and decided in common. Some individuals, either because of age, or ability, or prominence, became leaders. These were finally called elders or bishops. As the churches increased in size matters were left less to the entire body, and the organization became more definite. The officers were elected and they exalted their office. There was perhaps no uniform church government in New Testament times. The churches were scattered and there was but little communication between some of them. The New Testament age covers considerable time and different conditions are described in early and later times. In the Pastoral Epistles there seems to be a somewhat fixed order of church government, but there is not a fixed order applying to all churches of the apostolic age.

It would perhaps be overstating it to say the New Testament writers had no interest in the church as an institution, but this certainly was a secondary interest. They emphasized the lordship of Jesus and the necessity of following the leading of his spirit. They took it for granted that those who were following Jesus

were a part of the church, and any organization they had was simply a means of helping these followers to best do Christ's will. When we get that conception of the church, Christian union will be easy and it will be inevitable. It will be easy because the extension of the Kingdom of God will be considered of more importance than the building up of our own denomination. It will be inevitable because it will be felt that the divided condition of the church is not the best organization for the bringing in of God's Kingdom. May the church of Christ so breathe in the spirit of Jesus and the apostles that it shall lose sight of ecclesiasticism and think only of the winning of the world to God.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We are now to listen to two appointed speakers upon this theme. The first is Rev. W. B. Wallace, Cleveland, Ohio. Will Mr. Wallace take the platform?

REV. WILLIAM B. WALLACE, D.D. (Baptist), of Cleveland, Ohio, spoke as follows:

#### DOES THE NEW TESTAMENT CONTEMPLATE THE CHURCH AS AN INSTITUTION?

If we are to answer this question, there must first be an understanding of terms. What do we mean by the "church"? the church universal, or the church individual? the church invisible, or visible? the church ideal, or actual?

In the old Grecian days, when a meeting was desired, the people were called to assemble together, and their assembly was known as the "ecclesia," or "called-out." This term came to be used to describe the assembled Christians. I shall assume that the local assembly of the "called-out" ones of Christ is what is meant by the term "church" in our theme.

What do we mean by "institution"? When Diogenes was looking for a man, he had his idea of manhood and then looked for someone to come up to his idea. Does the New Testament contemplate the church as an institution? We must first have an understanding as to what "institution" is, and then see if there be anything in the New Testament contemplation of the church that is parallel with that understanding.

There are many definitions of the term "institution." Among them I find this one in the *Century Dictionary*: "An institution is an organized society or body of persons usually with a fixed place of assemblage and operation, and devoted to a special pursuit or purpose." If we accept this definition, we notice that there are three distinct marks of an institution; namely, organization, localization, and specialization. It is our task to discover if the New Testament contemplates the church as bearing these distinctive marks.

#### I. ORGANIZATION

*First*, does the New Testament contemplate the church as marked by organization? Dr. Strong in his *Theology* quotes R. S. Storrs as saying: "When any truth becomes central and vital, then comes a desire to utter it." And Dr. Strong adds: "Not only in words, but in organization." Jesus Christ was possessed with a great idea; namely, that through faith in him the sons of men could be saved from sin, and the Kingdom of God be established on earth. To give expression to this idea, Jesus Christ called to his side disciples. In Mark 1:16-20, we read of his calling Simon, Andrew, James, and John to follow him. Then, too, in Mark 3:14 we have the account of the appointing of the Twelve—"that they might be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach." Day after day, by fellowship, example, and instruction, he filled them with his own purposes and plans. Luke tells us (Luke 10:1) that he appointed seventy others and sent them, two by two, before his face into every city and place whither he himself was about to go.

In the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* is this significant statement: "A society, to be plainly visible and unmistakable, requires some outward act or sign of distinction by which its members can be recognized." In the institutions of baptism and the Lord's Supper Jesus supplied this essential of an organization.

After the resurrection of Christ great growth marks organization in the church. When we turn to the Book of Acts, we find a clear-cut picture of an organized body of people at Jerusalem. As an organization, the church selects a successor to Judas (Acts 1:23-26). As an organization, the church has people added to



its membership (Acts 2:41). As an organization, the church continues in the apostles' teaching of fellowship and the breaking of bread and the prayers (Acts 2:42). As an organization, the church makes provision for needy brethren (Acts 11:29). As an organization, the church sends forth missionaries to the work (Acts 13:3). In the epistles, too, there is a conception of the church as an organized body. Letters of Paul, of Peter, of James, and of John are addressed to organized bodies of Christians. We find Paul using such figures as "God's building" (I Cor. 3:9) and "the body of Christ" (Eph. 1:23); which go to show that he conceived of the church as an organization.

Does the New Testament contemplate the church as an institution? If we understand organization to be one of the marks of an institution, we must give an affirmative answer. Jesus had an idea, and sought for organized effort to give it expression. That organized effort appears during his ministry, and in completer form after his resurrection.

## II. LOCALIZATION

In our definition of an institution we note that "an institution has usually a fixed place of assemblage and operation;" that is, that it is marked by localization. Does the New Testament contemplate the church as localized? Emphatically, yes. In the early chapters of the Book of Acts, we have the church at Jerusalem, not dealing in "airy nothings," and having a "local habitation and a name." The church, at the first, meets in the house of a prominent member, as the house of Mark (Acts 12:12), or the house of James (Acts 21:18). As the membership of the church increases other houses are opened; thus it is we find letters addressed to the house congregations, as in Paul's letter to Philemon, and his letter to the Colossians. There seems to be a suggestion in James 2:2 of a larger meeting-place for the church than the individual houses.

After persecution came upon the church in Jerusalem, we read in Acts 8:4 that the disciples of Christ were scattered abroad and went about preaching the word. Grand pioneers they were. With God's "whisper" in their souls, they crossed hostile mountains and won new territory for the King of kings. As I read

the story of their achievement, I seem to be standing by a river, deep and broad and free, flowing with majestic movement toward the ocean, and I hear the song of the Chattahoochee:

But oh, not the hills of Habersham,  
 And oh, not the valleys of Hall  
 Avail: I am fain for to water the plain.  
 Downward the voices of Duty call—  
 Downward, to toil and be mixed with the main;  
 The dry fields burn, and the mills are to turn,  
 And a myriad flowers mortally yearn,  
 And the lordly main from beyond the plain  
 Calls o'er the hills of Habersham,  
 Calls through the valleys of Hall.

Onward and outward they went, to "water the plain" and make the wilderness rejoice and blossom as the rose. Church after church came into being, until there was the church at Antioch, Gallacia, Ephesus, Thessalonica, Corinth, Rome. Now Paul may write his epistles to the churches therein addressed, and John may record the message of the Spirit to the seven churches of Asia.

### III. SPECIALIZATION

Recalling our definition of an institution, we find that it is devoted "to a special pursuit or purpose." This certainly is a characteristic of the New Testament church. In Eph. 5:23 Paul speaks of Christ as the Head of the church, and of the church as his body. It is the function of the body to carry out the will of the head. One great purpose Christ had; namely, the establishment of the Kingdom of God. This desire appeared in his prayers, in his works, his teachings, and his commands.

George Frederick Watts has a famous picture entitled "Mammon." It presents a throned figure clad in richest robes, and with the face of a blind beast. Beneath his crushing hand is the figure of a woman; beneath his cruel foot, the figure of a man. In the background there is the smoke of sacrifice. When Jesus Christ came into this world he saw false gods sitting on the throne, and dedicated himself to the task of casting them down and establishing the rule of a king, who "shall come down like rain upon the mown grass, and as showers that water the earth."

The church as the body of Christ is specialized to carry out this desire of the Head of the church. She is here to establish the Kingdom of God. She is to do this intensively. "The Kingdom of God is within you." Many of the great sayings of Jesus and the great words of the apostle Paul are addressed to Christians to cleanse their own hearts and let Christ have supreme rule in their lives.

The New Testament conceives of the church, too, as building up the Kingdom of God extensively. "Ye shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and in the uttermost parts of the earth." The church is to keep working away until the kingdoms of this world shall be the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; "until every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Moreover, the New Testament contemplates the church as attaining this end in a definite manner, namely, by worship and by works.

I have read of a celebrated artist, who had upon his easel beautiful gems to tone up his sense of color. It would be a good thing if the modern church, in seeking to throw upon the canvas of our day and generation pictures that may honor God and bless mankind, would keep before her this New Testament conception of the church as a worshipping and a working church.

The early church continued steadfastly in the apostle's teaching and fellowship in the breaking of bread and the prayers. The New Testament expects the church to continue this custom: "Let us consider one another to provoke unto love and good works; not forsaking our own assembling together as the custom of some is, but consulting one another; and so much the more as you see the day drawing nigh" (Heb. 10:24, 25); "Speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs" (Eph. 5:19).

There is a tendency upon the part of some people in these days to emphasize works apart from the public worship in God's house. There are those who seem to feel that they can do God's will and carry out the purposes of Christ without assembling themselves in the sanctuary for praise and prayer. This tendency is a dangerous one. Says Dr. Forsyth in his *Positive Preaching*

*and the Modern Mind*, "We may feel that the love of humanity could not survive apart not only from our love of Christ, but also from the personal communion with Christ in the church, which feeds that love."

In *The Church and the Changing Order* Shailer Mathews remarks that the one supreme mission of the Church is religious: "However much a church may emphasize charitable organizations, amusements, employment bureaus, a consciousness of its spiritual mission must be its co-ordinating and unifying force." The church must remember the truth of Henry Van Dyke's parable, "The Source," and know that if she neglects the hour of worship in the sanctuary, the day will come when her name will be Abliſ—forsaken; no more Salome—City of Peace.

But while the New Testament contemplates that the church should advance in the Kingdom of God through worship, it also conceives of the church as carrying on the same task by works. The New Testament church throbs with activity. The men that make up her membership feel that they are chosen witnesses of the grace of God. They meet to sing and pray, and then go forth to preach and serve.

While, as I have said, there is a tendency now-a-days on the part of some people to emphasize works and neglect worship, so, on the other hand, with some others there is a tendency to emphasize worship and neglect works. There are those whose religious life is largely sentimental. They admire Christ as one admires a great portrait in a gallery. They seem to forget that Christ is a person—not a mere painting; that he is here to establish his kingdom, and they are subjects to carry out his will. Wendell Phillips used to declare that Christianity is a battle—not a dream. He spoke of mummies hidden in the churches; metaphysicians dividing the truth according to the north or northwestern side of a hair. Said he, "They will never be crucified; never hear the Pharisees and Sadducees fretting that their time has come; never have the devils of their own age asking to be sent unto the swine."

Says F. B. Meyer: "If we insist that the supreme test of faith is works, and of love, brotherhood, we are as likely as not to be made to drink Christ's cup of rejection and be baptized with the

baptism of his sufferings." Surely the church needs to be reminded today that—

Only Love's great eyes inspire  
Church, sect, creed to glow with fire.

Bishop Greer, the new bishop of New York, on returning from the Lambeth Conference is reported as saying that "the church is a world-force, concerned with the welfare of no one class or nation or race, but intent upon the salvation of the world. The church is to save the world by *serving* it. It must contribute in every possible way to the happiness and welfare of the human race, working through every kind of channel—social, civic, religious or of whatever nature—for the common good; *that it might minister, like its Master, to the manifold needs of man.*" This conception of the church is in harmony with the New Testament view. God haste the day when it shall be the universal conception of confessing Christians, and everyone shall be, like General Booth, "hungry for hell," that he may change hell to heaven.

Kipling has a very suggestive poem entitled, "Jubal and Tubal":

Jubal sang of the wrath of God  
And the curse of thistle and thorn—  
But Tubal got him a pointed rod,  
And scrabbled the earth for corn.

Jubal sang of the new-found sea,  
And the souls its waves divide—  
But Tubal hollowed a fallen tree  
And passed to the farther side.

Jubal sang of the golden years  
When wars and wounds shall cease—  
But Tubal fashioned the hand-flung spears  
And showed his neighbors peace.

Jubal sang of the cliffs that bar  
And the peaks that none may crown—  
But Tubal clambered by jut and scar  
And there he builded a town.

God be praised for the Jubals in the church—those who dream

and sing and speak; but what is needed in our day is more of the Tubal spirit. Let the modern church study the New Testament church, and read the story of those early workers who were not disobedient to the heavenly vision; who held their lives of no account that they might accomplish their course; who shrank not from declaring the whole counsel of God, until it shall have become possessed with the holy determination to add works to worship, and by deeds make its dreams come true.

May the Lord give to the modern church more Tubals, who shall go forth to change deserts to gardens, to bridge all separating seas, and bring the "sullen sundered peoples to earth's remotest end around the hearthstone of their welcome and the home-light of their love," to hasten the fulfilment of the angelic prophecy, "Peace on earth, good-will to men;" and in spite of difficulties, and on top of them, to rear, stone by stone, in tangible form, the Kingdom of our God.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: I would like to call the attention of the Congress to the provision made for a general discussion of these themes. After the second prepared speaker delivers his message there will be an opportunity for anyone to speak upon this theme. It will be necessary, however, for you to send up your card to the Secretary. There are pages here, and if you will lift your hand with your card, they will bring it forward to the Secretary, or you can bring it forward yourself. We hope that quite a number will avail themselves of this privilege and speak to us upon this theme this afternoon.

We will now listen to the second appointed speaker, Professor Shirley J. Case, of the University of Chicago.

PROFESSOR SHIRLEY J. CASE, PH.D. (Free Baptist):

"If I were asked to answer this question that is before us, in a single word without further limiting the definition, my reply would be an emphatic affirmative. I should presuppose, to begin with, that we ought to find the church idea at least in the New Testament, for it is as old as the history of the human race. Man is instinctively religious, and in all ages and in all circumstances we find him expressing that religious instinct in association with his fellow-men.

The church idea strikes its roots deep into the soil of human history.

And I have another general reason: I should expect to find the church idea in the New Testament because it is the church that has given us our New Testament. It is the church that has preserved for us the words of the Master and the story of his life. How much less rich our New Testament literature would be had there never been a church at Thessalonica, or at Corinth, or at Rome, or elsewhere.

Then I find in the New Testament definite references which warrant me in believing that the New Testament contemplated the church. Here we find the church mentioned as we have already heard today. We find Paul living his whole life for the sake of the church. We find him traveling over seas, we find him journeying hither and thither, all in the interests of the church.

But, if the question were put more pointedly as it has been put by the speakers today, and I were asked just what the New Testament idea is in its exact form, I should be somewhat puzzled, puzzled because I do not find in the New Testament that the idea has been worked out in its full form; it is there in germ. If you turn to the life of those first believers as they were assembled in Jerusalem, you do not see them with an established ritual, but you do find them with a burning heart, with a soul that is full of the fire of love. You find them ready, after they have been touched by the spirit of their Master, to go forth in loving service for humanity. You find them there with a message of social salvation all ready to be delivered, to be worked out under the conditions which they shall meet here and there and elsewhere.

I need not say today that we are in difficulty when we turn to find the New Testament conception, from the fact that even the forms we do find do not always agree among the different churches. The church in Jerusalem was not at all like the church in gentile territory. You could call the Jewish church in its incipient stage scarcely more than a Jewish guild. The disciples who gathered in Jerusalem were Jews and loyal to the law of Moses, and they resented it very much indeed that the apostle

Paul does not require the gentile to accept the Mosaic dispensation. We do not find a uniformly worked-out system which we can apply as the New Testament pattern of the church, but we do find that the New Testament has a certain unity in its conception of the church's functions.

What is the mission of the church idea as contemplated by the New Testament? It has the divine sanction of service. It is required everywhere that the believers shall live for their Master and not for themselves, and that they shall put forth this bodiless spirit in a form which shall live and be powerful in the world. Now, it has always been recognized by all men that a disembodied spirit, while perhaps playing an important part in one's thought and one's life, for practical purposes is of very little use. Therefore, there is only one thing to do when a man in this age—or in that age—gets hold of the church idea, the germ, and that is for him to give expression in tangible form of that which was enthroned in his heart and in his life. Therefore we see the early disciples gathering together and using the ordinances of baptism as an initiatory rite, not as a magical rite, perhaps; yet attaching some special significance to it. We find them gathering together and eating a common meal in order that they may express their common fellowship. Do they attach any extraordinary value to this as an ordinance? Probably not, but it has for them a greater value in that it expresses something which is within their hearts, something that is deep down in their lives—the idea that they must live to minister the ends of the gospel.

Now, can it be said that the church today does conform to the New Testament conception in that general and undefined way? We sometimes hear people say, "Back to the primitive simplicity; away with the elaborate organizations of this day and generation." I have no sympathy with that sort of a cry. To me it seems that the New Testament church is no more the ideal church for this day than is Paul's method of crossing the ocean in an old Roman freight boat the ideal way for a modern missionary to reach a foreign land. The church of today will not live by imitating any form of church in the past, for imitation itself produces death. I remember reading in Dr. Horton's



Yale lectures an illustration in point. He says in the sculpture gallery in Rome one may see the busts of the emperors, complete or nearly complete, beginning with the early Caesars and coming down to the Gothic period. At first one's eye is greeted by the noble marbles of the early Caesars. He follows the decline of the art down until he comes to the period of the Gothic emperors, and art has disappeared, and one sees there just a caricature of a man; scarcely more than the wooden doll of a child, and he reflects upon it: he says, "The heir of all the ages, this last artist, produced this."

It is true always that imitation alone is deadly. It is only inner life that can give power and strength. And so it is in the church of God. While we revere and respect those early days when the disciples were working out, as best they could under the circumstances of their age, the ideas which they possessed, yet we recognize that the church of today stands on its own feet. It is an institution now, in very many senses different from what it was years ago. It is not today the same church that it was at the time when the Nicene creed was given forth institutionally; it is not the same church today in which our grandfathers worshiped. It is veritably an ancient institution but it is not an antiquated one, and may it never be! If it loses its ability to adapt itself to the changing needs of every age, if it forgets that its mission is primarily for the ends of the gospel and not for its own self-preservation, it will forfeit its right to exist and likewise its rights to be called the Church of the Living God, the pillar and ground of truth.

**PRESIDENT JACKSON:** Are there any cards to come forward from any who would choose to address us this afternoon? If not, perhaps it will be time for us to draw this session to a close.

**DR. ALBERT G. LAWSON:** Before we are dismissed I hope that the Secretary will be kind enough to give again the notice which he gave at the opening of the session.

**PRESIDENT JACKSON:** You are requested, Dr. Gessler, to give that notice which was given at the opening of the meeting.

**SECRETARY GESSLER:** There is to be this afternoon a meeting

of conference to which you are invited, and in this meeting the question of entering into a closer union of these denominations in congress work is to be discussed. I can hardly tell you what form that discussion will take because I do not know how the minds of the brethren are turned. The question is one of drawing together, either in other gatherings similar to this or in a more clearly united form. It may profit us to come together to discuss the difficulties and to find out what is keeping us apart and how we can get closer together.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: I have also another announcement to make: Dr. Mathews, dean of the University of Chicago, would like to invite the visiting delegates to take lunch at the University Commons. All visiting delegates are invited to take lunch with the professors of the university tomorrow at half-past twelve. They would be glad to have you come at half-past eleven and someone will be present to show you about the university grounds and buildings. It will be necessary for us to know today or at the close of the session this evening how many are going to this luncheon. If you will give your names to Dr. Parker or to myself, we will be glad to welcome all who are here from a distance to the university tomorrow at noon.

I will again call attention to the session tonight and to the sessions on Wednesday and Thursday. I think this will probably close this part of our meeting.

I will ask Doctor Hunt, of Ohio, to step forward and lead us in prayer.

The closing prayer was offered by Dr. Emory W. Hunt, of Granville, Ohio, after which an adjournment was taken until 8 o'clock P. M.

---

FIRST DAY

*Evening Session*

November 10, 1908

8 o'clock P. M.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: The hour has arrived for the evening session of this Congress. Let us sing two verses of Hymn No. 1,056, "The Church's One Foundation Is Jesus Christ, Her Lord."

At the conclusion of the hymn, Professor Errett Gates, of Chicago, invoked the divine blessing.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: At the opening of this session, you are to have an address of welcome, first by Harry Pratt Judson, president of the University of Chicago, and the president of our Northern Baptist Convention. He represents the municipality.

### ADDRESSES OF WELCOME

PRESIDENT HARRY PRATT JUDSON, LL.D., THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO:

*Members of the Congress, Mr. President, Ladies, and Gentlemen:* I am asked to extend a welcome to this Congress on behalf of this municipality, not because I have the honor to be connected with the city government; I have never been a mayor or an alderman or anything of that sort, I am glad to say; but, I suppose, because I am a citizen of Chicago and every citizen of Chicago is a member of the municipality; and the citizens of Chicago, proud of their city, are intensely jealous of anything that makes for its higher life and intensely pained by everything that tends toward the lower life of this great mass of people. And, in that sense, I am sure that I represent the municipality in its better sense in welcoming to our city this Congress with its great themes of thought to be freely discussed in this presence.

I am glad to welcome the Congress because it is a Baptist congress, if you please. I understand there are various kinds of Baptists who are gathered here tonight. A good friend of mine was saying the other day that he has learned of late that among different Christian bodies there are possibly ninety-five points in common and five points of diversity, and if that is true I fancy the difference between the old times and our times is this: that in the times long past we spent the most of our attention on the five points of diversity and now we are learning to concentrate our minds on the ninety-five points of unity, which occurs to me, as a layman, Mr. President, as being a very rational and sensible proposition.

However these different kinds of Baptists may differ, I fancy they are alike in some essentials which make a congress a

very proper thing to gather in their name. A congress is not a legislative body. We are so accustomed to speak of our Congress at Washington as the national legislature that we forget that the real sense of a congress is by no means a body empowered to make laws, and there is no body of men on God's earth that can make laws for a Baptist, that is, ecclesiastically speaking.

As I understand it, the Baptist is essentially one who believes that there should be no creed, no ecclesiastic organization between his soul and his Maker. He is bound always to liberty of conscience, to liberty of doctrine for himself. Again, he is one who believes that between his Church and his Maker there should be no creed binding him and no ecclesiastical authority controlling him, and so there is no body recognized by Baptists which will make laws that bind him or his church. And, the Northern Baptist Convention, which I have the honor to represent, is not a legislative body; it is simply a body which is the agent of the Baptist churches in this country in carrying on their common purposes more efficiently. It takes orders, it does not give them; it is the servant of the churches and the people, it is not their master; and whatever particular form of Baptist you are, I fancy you will find that you are that kind of a Baptist.

We welcome you then here because you are not a law-making body, making rules to control the consciences or the intellects of the people who form your constituency, but you are a congress in the proper sense of that term, i. e., a deliberative body; and we welcome you to Chicago because our city welcomes to its borders all who come with thoughts worthy of discussion.

And in this presence, one of the most important things in our churches is to be able to have a forum where we may meet and freely discuss the different subjects that engage our thoughts. We do not need as a result of that discussion to adopt resolutions; we do not need as a result of that discussion to make rules; we do not need as a result of that discussion to formulate creeds, but the air is always cleared by free discussion face to face. I have often found that people and groups of people grievously misunderstand one another and get into mutual dislike and ill-will, owing in a great number of cases to a mere lack of understand-

ing; and the best way for a mutual understanding is to come together and look one another in the face and say freely out what is in the heart, and nine out of ten people who mean the right thing, when they do that, will clear away the clouds of misconception and find that after all they are looking eye to eye toward the same glorious view.

And for that reason, then, we welcome this forum of free discussion of the great facts that engage the thoughts of all the people and all these kinds of Baptists. For all these reasons, then, Mr. Chairman, and Ladies and Gentlemen, on behalf of the citizenship of Chicago, I extend to this Congress a cordial welcome, a cordial greeting, and the good wishes of our citizens interested in the higher life and the higher things of this life, with the sincere hope that in these papers and discussions here presented we may reach nearer and nearer to truth, because after all truth lies at the basis of the life of our nation.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We will listen now to an address of welcome by Bishop Fallows, who is not only a bishop of the Reformed Episcopal church, but the bishop of all of us; he is the bishop of this Christian community and therefore he represents this community in these words of welcome.

RIGHT REV. SAMUEL FALLOWS, D.D., LL.D.:

*Mr. President, and Brethren of the Congress, and Ladies and Gentlemen:* I am very much obliged for these gracious words which have fallen from the lips of your President, and I need not say how highly honored I feel in being the bishop of such a glorious body of men and women as I see before me this evening.

Now, there is one point in common between the Episcopalian—of the right kind, I mean (laughter)—and the Baptists, so far as regards former days. We both had to experience rather drastic treatment at the hands of the Puritans in the days of old. You know something about how it was with the one who was the champion of Baptist principles; and in a Boston newspaper, when Bishop Seabury had been consecrated the Bishop of Connecticut, there came this declaration: "The most wonderful thing beneath the sun! The Stamp Act in Boston and an Episcopal bishop in

Connecticut"—and we were not received with very much favor.

An eminent divine of the Church of England once said, "Plato is but the rudiment of an Adam and Aristotle the rubbish of Paradise." An eminent American clergyman said later, "Adam was but a raw possibility."

Chicago is the embodiment of all excellences in the view of some; in the view of others, like slavery, she is the sum of all villanies.

"Are you sanctified?" was asked by the good Bishop Hamline of the Methodist Episcopal church when the witty and brave proven preacher, Peter Cartwright, was indulging in some pleasantry at a session of the Illinois Conference. "Yes, Bishop," was the prompt reply of Cartwright, "in spots."

Chicago is sanctified in spots. She is not yet by any means perfect, but she is going on by degrees to perfection. And I can safely aver that she is sanctified in as many spots as any other city on the globe.

Over against our cardinal crimes, put our colossal charities; over against the repellent, yet needed, features of our stockyards, put our art museums; over against our seven thousand saloons, put our one thousand churches; over against the discordant cries of our streets, put the entrancing symphonies of our orchestral hall; over against the pull of our dives to draw our children down, put the pull of our common and parochial schools to draw them up; over against the materialistic tendency, of our Board of Trade, our manufactories, our dealings in stocks and bonds, our day-books and ledgers, put the idealistic and elevating teachings of our noble universities, diffusing continually "sweetness and light;" over against all the tendencies to ignorance and littleness of thought put our magnificent libraries with their garnered wealth of knowledge and the gracious and broadening influence of the elect leaders of mankind.

Thus while the forces of evil are astir the forces of good are not asleep. There are men in the ministry and in the laity who are armed *cap-à-pie* in the struggle for righteousness. They do not fight in intrenchments, but seek out the enemy and give him battle. The victory is not always theirs for the millennium has not yet come. But they never know when they are beaten,

but again and again and again re-form their lines and renew the onset. They know the battle is the Lord's and the issue in the end cannot be doubtful.

Christian Chicago realizes that the whole world is at its doors. Every language under heaven is uttered in its ears. Every church is a missionary church. The fields are already white unto the harvest. The devout petition of every pastor is, "Lord send forth more laborers into thy harvest."

I need not say that we all of every faith fully recognize the great work the Baptist churches are doing for the welfare of the city. They are among the foremost in every movement to establish and enlarge the one kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. They are true to the gospel teachings and heroic life of Roger Williams. They ring out his war cry, "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." They echo the words of Wayland Hoyt, "I am a Christian first and a Baptist next."

And what is true of the Baptists is also true of the Disciples of Christ in their supreme loyalty to the great Head of the church. No king's pen-knife for them has cut out any leaves from the Book of God and the Book of man. An unmutilated Bible is in their hands. They stand foursquare to all the world in proclaiming their belief in the one indivisible word from Genesis to Revelation. They have set the pace for us all in their earnest and triumphant evangelism. Alexander Campbell with his passion for souls is yet preaching in their pulpits. And

The old time religion  
Is good enough for me,

is the rapturous song of its incoming multitudes, as,

Exults the rising soul  
Disburdened of its load  
And swells unutterably full  
Of glory and of God.

Therefore, brethren praying fervently for the Spirit of the living God to lead you into all truth, I now with all my heart, and yet voicing but too feebly the sentiments of the entire Christian community of Chicago, give you a most hearty welcome to our hospitable city.

REV. JOHN L. JACKSON, D.D.:

It becomes my duty and my pleasure to thank these gentlemen for these gracious words of welcome with which they have greeted the Congress. Chicago has a well-earned reputation for hospitality—for hospitality to persons and hospitality to ideas. I am sure that she will not fail to show herself at her best on this occasion.

I have known something about this Congress for some years, about the Baptist side of this Congress, at least, and all I know is to its honor. It is true that sometimes it comes into a city and stirs up the churches, the pastors and the community, but it does all this in the most charming way possible and with the very loftiest of purposes. It always proceeds with the presupposition that there is something more to learn and something better to do, and then it tries, in a humble way, to join forces with all those powers that are making for enlightenment and for inspiration.

This I think is true, that when this Congress closes its sessions, generally, and I may say always, it carries with it the good will of the community and the city where it has built its broad platform. We do not mean that all accept its opinion, but we mean this: That those who come to listen are interested and profited, and go away with kinder sympathies and with a broader vision. I am sure that every great denomination requires just such a broad and free platform as we have here. Certainly Baptists and Disciples do, for we believe in liberty of opinion and we demand the right to express our opinion. There are many questions, religious, ethical, social, and civic, which we cannot bring to our state and national conventions, which we can most fittingly discuss on a platform like this. And I am satisfied that even the birth of our new Northern Baptist Convention will not take away from this Congress its peculiar function, its great prerogative.

Not only does every denomination need a platform of this character, but it is helpful to every community occasionally to have a gathering of this kind. I think I can safely say that into whatsoever city this Congress has ever come it has always inspired the minds of the citizens with high and lofty thinking. It certainly serves a great purpose, if it leads men to forget for



a time their pursuit of wealth and of pleasure and to center their attention upon the great problems of religion and of social obligation. Everywhere and always this Congress has done that.

I remember, eleven years ago, when we welcomed this Congress to Chicago, that after the closing of its sessions those themes lingered in our hearts and on our lips for many, many days. We discussed them in our ministers' conferences. We preached them from our pulpits. We talked about them in our prayer meetings. I am sure that taken all in all the influence of that gathering was most beneficent. Hence these brethren may well welcome again this noble organization to this city and to the Northwest.

As you all know, the unique feature of this Congress is that we have gathered here as representatives of three great denominations. We have come together in all seriousness to ask ourselves if we cannot come into closer fellowship. First of all, we must come to know each other, and where else can we begin this friendship more satisfactorily than in this Congress? Where else could we meet more fittingly than in this building where I think we have the first illustration of the union of two great churches in these two denominations? We call it the Memorial Church, and it may be a memorial for these denominations for many years to come. We have come here honestly and fairly to discuss this question, and we wish to hear both sides of it, for there are two sides to it.

I attended our Baptist state convention a few days ago and I heard some earnest words of protest against this union. There are some things to be said on that side, but many things can be said in favor of putting aside as soon as possible these differences and coming together in the fellowship of a common service.

I remember to have read of a woman who attended an auction. Crowded into one corner she saw a piece of furniture offered for sale which she wanted. She bid two dollars. Somebody off in another corner bid two dollars and a half. She bid three dollars; three and a half, was bid on the other side. She thought that all it was worth, and shook her head. The auctioneer said, "Going, going, gone. Knocked down to Mr. Jonathan Jones." The woman cried out, "Jonathan Jones! Why, he is my husband."

Then she turned and said, "Why, you old fool, you have been bidding against your wife!" (laughter).

Now, I think, brethren, we have been bidding against each other long enough. Let us strike hands and march forward under the banner of the Lord of Hosts.

We are to hear now a short report from the treasurer of the Congress, Dr. Matteson.

Dr. Matteson then briefly presented the financial needs of the Congress. An offering was received.

BISHOP FALLOWS: I wish to state to the audience that I should like to stay and hear the rest of these important proceedings, but I am due at another important Baptist convention on the West Side this evening.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We will sing once more before we commence with the next part of the programme. Let us rise and sing Hymn No. 654, the first, second, and fifth stanzas.

(The Congress arose and sang the hymn)

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We are now prepared to proceed with the discussion of the theme of the evening, "What Are the Legitimate Limits of Free Speech in a Republic?" The first writer is Hon. Wallace Heckman of this city.

HON. WALLACE HECKMAN (Free Baptist), Chicago, Ill., read the following paper:

#### WHAT ARE THE LEGITIMATE LIMITS OF FREE SPEECH IN A REPUBLIC?

It might be replied in brief that its limit is at slander and libel, treasonable, immoral utterances, and such as incite to crime.

Speech, the expression of opinion or the communication of thought, is so obviously a part of the simple act of living, the natural exercise of the faculties, that its fullest and freest use outside of obviously essential limitations seems to be a primary right, such as that of self-preservation. In its exercise the highest pleasure is participated in by multitudes and enthusiasms created which remain happy inspirations to high purpose and noble action. Such was Henry's consuming appeal to the Virginians, Washington's poised far-seeing farewell address, Webs-

ter's overwhelming reply to Hayne, Lincoln's unanswerable arraignment of the right of men to buy and sell other men. A foremost dynamic force, it makes up a large part of daily life, and more and more so as intelligence and advantages of culture extend until the supreme joy is reached in conversation between congenial spirits, each enriching the other with new thoughts and fresh inspirations. Is it not astonishing that in large communities this natural and supreme right—the right of speech—is regarded as a gift from the sovereign and limited to the terms of the grant? One may there speak what he has been granted permission to say and on topics which he has granted permission to speak about. In art, in music, in literature, in all that goes to make up civilized life, the better part of the Russian people are advanced to a high degree of culture, but if we were under Russian law half of us would by tomorrow be trudging wearily toward inhospitable Alaska for recalling to each other the delights of speech and defending the natural right to its enjoyment. In progressive Germany they did not, until Maximilian Harden set the example last week, discuss the government or emperor.

In a republic the fullest freedom is afforded as a check on the conduct of the men in office, limited only against injury to others or the public. Law is public opinion enacted into statute; the limitation of public utterance is a limitation founded in public opinion.

Here comment, criticism, censure, praise of public men and public affairs are part of the daily thoughts of the intelligent citizen, which give to life its freshness and variety. The citizen has a clear right freely to discuss the principles and form of government, to arraign with fair argument the officers, executives, and magistrates, but not to libel them or hold them up to indiscriminate contempt. This right has been painfully guarded and its product is free government in which it is bedded as a cornerstone.

The federal constitution provides (Art. I) that "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press," and the constitution of Illinois, that "every person may freely speak, write and publish on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of that liberty. . . . And in all trials for libel,

both civil and criminal, the truth when published with good motives and for justifiable ends shall be a sufficient defense." Government by the people would be impossible without this freedom, and yet a no less distinguished jurist than David Dudley Field asserted that "if a constitutional provision on the subject of the press is needed at all it is for its restraint instead of its protection" (*International Review*, July-August, 1876). In the course of an article on this subject Mr. Field said:

The condition of the newspaper press of this country is a subject of constant observation and constant complaint. Nobody defends it. The newspapers themselves deplore it. . . . Jefferson said in his time that the press was putrid. It has since become putrescence putrified. The first effect is to make cowards of nine-tenths of our public men. . . . Our law of libel, it must be confessed, is imperfect and our administration of it still more so. It is generally assumed that the truth of a story is a sufficient reason for publishing it. The assumption is wrong. . . . There are many cases where the truth should not be published. Everywhere else in the world reputation is protected. It is only here that it has lost all protection. The practical result of a civil trial for libel nowadays is a reversal of positions and a trial of the plaintiff upon his general character instead of a trial of the defendant for libel.

Jefferson had reason to know something of the treatment accorded by newspapers of his time, for it was on the charge of libeling him that Croswell was indicted. Croswell published in the *Wasp*, a Federal newspaper, in 1802, that Jefferson paid Callender for calling Washington a traitor, a robber, and a perjurer; for calling Adams a hoary-headed incendiary; and for most grossly slandering the private character of men whom he knew to be virtuous. In this celebrated case Alexander Hamilton, jealous of the right of free speech, volunteered as counsel for the defendant, and, though defeated, conducted the case with consummate skill.

According to President Cleveland, conditions had not improved in 1885. He said (Keppler letter, December 12, 1885):

I have just received your letter with the newspaper clipping which caused you so much annoyance. I do not think there ever was a time when newspaper writing was so general and so mean as at present, and there never was a country under the sun where it flourished as it does

in this. The falsehoods daily brought before the people in our newspapers, while they are proofs of the mental ingenuity of those engaged in newspaper work, are insults to the American love for decency and fair play, of which we boast.

Again at Harvard (November 8, 1886) he said:

This trait of our national character would not encourage, if their extent and tendency were fully appreciated, the silly, mean and cowardly lies that every day are found in the columns of certain newspapers which violate every instinct of American manliness and with ghoulish glee desecrate every sacred relation of private life.

In fostering liberty of the press perhaps we have forgotten or are forgetting necessary vitally essential limitations. Its abuses are astounding. To such proportions have the evils of newspaper sensationalism grown that a national libel law is advocated and federal postal control invoked. The evil does not stop at individuals. The public, the children, and that large fraction of the members of society who are in a sense the wards of the strong, are its innocent victims. As a modern critic has recently said:

The sensational newspapers have done many things which our ancestors would have thought impossible. They have enormously increased the number of those who know crime in all its forms by putting before children the faces of murderers and of fallen women, by vivid presentations of the rooms in which crimes have been committed, by graphic portrayals of nude bodies, decapitated legs, fragments of legs and arms; by blood stains on walls, tools of burglary; bludgeons and pistols with which men have been put to death. These journals rapidly train children to speak the language and understand the methods of criminals of all sorts. It means a great increase of criminals in the future and a bumper harvest for these same criminal journals.

Under the provision of this clause of the Constitution the government itself is assailed and its extinguishment boldly advocated. This right, like other natural rights, is bounded by those "restrictions on the actions of each individual which the supreme power of the state enforces in order that all of its members may follow their occupations with greater security." Its history is interesting. In the defense of Thomas Paine, Lord Erskine said, "There is one country [meaning England] where man can fairly exercise

his reason on the most important concerns of society, where he can boldly publish his judgment on the acts of the puissant and most powerful tyrants." "The liberty of the press," exclaimed Curran, "that sacred palladium which no influence, which no power, no minister, no government, which nothing but the depravity, or folly, or corruption of a jury can ever destroy."

Speech [said Charles James Fox] ought to be completely free. The press ought to be completely free. When any man may write and print what he pleases, though he is liable to be punished if he abused that freedom, this is perfect freedom. . . . I have never heard of any danger arising to a free state from the freedom of the press or freedom of speech. So far from it, I am perfectly clear that a free state cannot exist without both. It is not a law that is to be found in books that constitutes, that has constituted, the true principles of freedom in any country at any time. No, it is the energy, the boldness of a man's mind which permits him to speak not in private, but in large and popular assemblies, that constitutes, that creates in a state the spirit of freedom.

Give me but the liberty of the press [said Sheridan] and I will give to the minister a venal house of peers. I will give him a corrupt and servile house of commons. I will give him the full swing of the patronage of office and of ministerial influence. I will give him all the power that place can confer upon him to purchase by submission and overawe resistance, and yet, armed with the liberty of the press, I will go forth to meet him undismayed. I will attack the mighty fabric he has raised with that mightier engine. I will shake down from its height corruption and bury it beneath the ruins of the abuses it was meant to shelter.

In a free country [said Patterson] the rule should be that each citizen shall have all but the widest scope and encouragement to make his country's business his own, to communicate his opinion on every detail of its multifarious affairs, and of the officers in charge of it, as well as to know where his freedom in this particular ends and where the firm hand of irresistible authority commands silence.

No hard and fast rule has been found to define the full right of the individual, or the precise language which he may use in a particular instance, or which may on the other hand produce injurious results. The law has reposed injuries the province of judging what, in a particular instance, is an infraction of the law, and on the other hand charges a defendant with that knowledge which the average citizen possesses of that just line where right

ceases and the wrong begins. Thus, the calm, deliberate, public opinion is the measure of the right. The judgment of the average citizen determines the law.

As Wedderburn declared, "Libel is founded entirely upon public opinion. There is no other standard by which it can be measured or ascertained. Who then so proper as the people to determine the point?" (16 *Parl. Hist.*, 1294). And Camden, "Who shall have the care of the liberty of the press—the judges or the people of England? The jury are the people of England" (29 *Parl. Hist.*).

Libels are often judged by their effect rather than the language, and stirring men's passions and leading them to violent courses of conduct is sometimes deemed the gist of the offense (22 St.—357). As an eminent English authority said:

The difficulty of defining seditious libels, the law restraining them, the law that teaches how to foresee and avoid them, would often be inscrutable if it were not that in all cases it rests with the jury, that is to say, with a certain number of fellow-citizens of the accused fairly selected and capable of judging the dangers of too great liberty, and of tyranny on the other hand, to decide not only what is the fact, but what is the law. No man can be found guilty of exceeding the limit of free speech without this judgment of his community in some form.

In England, as Lord Erskine observed since Fox's Act, "Nothing is punished criminally as libel unless in the opinion of twelve honest, independent, and intelligent men it is mischievous and ought to be punished. . . . Speaking to a jury is in a manner speaking to a nation at large and flying for sanctuary to its universal justice."

The trial of Hone in 1818 was an example of the power of juries in the adjustment of common law and circumstances. Hone was tried three times in succession for "blasphemous libels." The judges told the jury in plain terms that they were blasphemous libels, but the defendant, without any assistance of counsel, persuaded the jury that the object was not profane, but political, and each of the juries in succession, after retiring, gave a verdict of not guilty.

So strictly is this doctrine held to that injunctions against libel, asked for on the ground of property being injured, have

been refused for the reason that juries only, and not courts, can decide whether a statement is libelous.

The departures from this rule of the final judgments of juries upon questions of libel and sedition are limited to, first, the line of decisions corrected by Fox's Act; second, the Act of Parliament of March, 1817, known as "The Seditious Meeting Act," limited in its operation for the period of a single year; third, "The Seditious Act" from December 24, 1819, for five years (Bentham, Vol. II, p.—); fourth, "The Sedition Act," passed by Congress April 30, 1790, to be in force to March 4, 1801.

Modern instances are not lacking of the adjustment of the rule to circumstances. During the rebellion, even in the most orderly part of the North, public opinion found one way or another of suppressing unpatriotic utterances. Over-confident freedom of the press both North and South was made to feel the power of this control in the demolition of printing plants or their military occupation, as in the case of the *Chicago Times* in the winter of 1862.

Some libels are excused for the reason that they are committed in the course of some lawful occupation which ranks higher in the general estimation by being a benefit to greater numbers than the injury done, which is usually confined to one person only.

Lord Ellenborough, chief justice, said:

Every person who publishes a book commits himself to the judgment of the public and any one may comment on his performance. Ridicule and contempt may be awarded without limit, but imputation of fraud, immorality, or corruption, bordering on crime, make the critic amenable to an action of libel. . . . There are privileged occasions and privileged communications. An attack made upon another's reputation by one who is not at the time engaged in any business of his own which the law protects is libel.

The candidate for public office invites investigation of his life and character. The Municipal Voters' League of this city was organized some twenty years ago. It had no special authority. At first by the selection from each ward of representative citizens who should take the initiative in looking after municipal matters, and later consisting of an executive committee which selects year



after year their own successors, it took upon itself the task of breaking up the organized corruption in the common council of the city, then notoriously corrupt, impudently purchasable, hilariously indifferent to charges of corruption. The league assumed the duty of gathering information as to the character, occupation, means of livelihood, sources of revenue, and real purposes and ambitions of aldermanic candidates. The vast task of making this investigation of some four hundred members of the community each year, having the information so verified that it was safe to make assertions which frequently caused candidates to withdraw their names, and others to menace the members of our committee with lawsuits for large sums, has been for many years bravely assumed and assiduously and insistently and thoroughly performed, and that too by men who are not indifferent to their financial risks, and some of whom have been men of reasonably substantial fortunes. They rely on, first, the truthfulness of their reports, on which they spare no time or labor to make complete and just; second, that no purpose shall exist in their work except to give the public accurate information concerning the characters of candidates for this responsible public office; third, the fairness of the public press, the justice and honesty of the average citizen who might ultimately be called on the jury to pass upon their conduct, the adequate public purpose which they seek to serve and the efficiency, industry, and impartiality with which they serve it. In its early history the committee of the league trenched consciously close upon the limit of their legal privilege in these public utterances and damage suits piled up by angry plaintiffs, but no one flinched and no judgment was ever gotten.

In contrast with this and the resultant public service rendered by the league will be noted the riotous ebullitions in 1882 of the men who pretended to espouse the cause of labor, the men who invoked and brought on the riots of 1877. The Haymarket murders were the natural and logical outgrowth of these utterances. The friends of Parsons, Spies, Schwab, Fielden, and the rest have always endeavored to carry the impression that these men were simply exercising the right of free speech, that their prosecution was for a species of political crime. Neither asser-

tion has any foundation in fact. This case deserves special attention in this connection. The defendants through their speeches and newspapers were engaged in the advocacy of a propaganda. Note some examples of their utterances:—

[March 2, 1885] That thing [that happened in Philadelphia] could not have happened in Chicago without placing on exhibition on the telegraph wires and cornices of houses a dozen cadavers of policemen in pieces for each broken skull of a workman. This is due solely to the revolutionary propaganda carried on here.

[March 23] Each working-man ought to have been armed long ago. Daggers and revolvers can easily be obtained. Hand grenades are cheaply produced. Explosives too can be obtained. . . . [April 8] A number of strikers in Quincy yesterday fired upon their bosses and not upon the scabs. This is recommended most emphatically for imitation. The working-men ought to take aim at every member of the militia. . . . Working-men arm yourselves! [May 7] Before you lies this blissful Eden, the road to which leads over the smoking ruins of the old world. Your passport to it is that banner which calls to you in flaming letters—the word “Anarchy.” [June 20] . . . To this end we must be wolves and as such we need sharp teeth. Working-men arm yourselves! [October 5, 1885] No day should pass without a report heard from one place or another of the finding of a carcass of one of the Pinkertons. [January 23, 1886] Therefore, comrades, aim to the death. [May 2, 1886] The order-soundrels beamed yesterday in their full glory. Who wants to attack capitalism in earnest must overthrow the bodyguards about it. [November 29, 1884] Nothing but an uprising of the people and the bursting open of all stores and storehouses to the free access of the public and the free application of dynamite to everyone who opposes will relieve the world of this infernal nightmare of property and wages. [November 29, 1884] Parson's Resolutions. The Black Flag. . . . Resolved that no man shall pay for anything or receive pay for anything or deprive himself of what he may desire that he finds out of use or vacant. . . . None can eat more than he ought under any system, or wear more than one suit of clothes at a time, or occupy more than one house. . . . As this system cannot be introduced against existing ignorance, selfishness, and distrust without the force of arms and strong explosives, therefore, be it resolved that when all stores, storehouses, vacant tenements and transporting property are thrown open and held open to the free access of the general public, the good of mankind and the saving of people requires that all forcible opposition should be dealt with summarily. [January 13, 1885] It is clearly more

humane to blow ten men into eternity than to make ten men starve to death. [February 21, 1885] Dynamite—of all the good stuff this is the stuff. Stuff several pounds of this sublime stuff into an inch pipe, block up both ends, insert a cap with a fuse, place this in the immediate neighborhood of a lot of rich loafers who live on the sweat of other people's brows and light the fuse. . . . A pound of this good stuff beats a bushel of ballots. [April 18, 1885] The present government must be destroyed. . . . No government can exist without a head and by assassinating the head just as fast as a government head appears, the government can be destroyed, and by this same process all other government can be kept out of existence. . . . He alone is free who submits to no government. All governments are domineering powers and any domineering power is a natural enemy to all mankind. . . . Assassinations will remove the evil from the face of the earth. . . . Assassination properly applied is wise, just, humane, and brave. For freedom all things are just. [April 26, 1886] Schwab: For every working-man who has died through the pistol of a deputy sheriff let ten of these executioners fall. Arm yourselves! [October 11, 1885] Spies: To make the movement in which they are engaged a successful one it must be a revolutionary one. [February 26, 1885] Parsons: I say to you, Arise one and all and let us exterminate them all. Woe to the police or the militia whom they send against us! [March 29, 1885] Fielden: A few explosives in the city of Chicago would help the cause considerably. [February 1886] Engel: Save up \$3.00 or \$4.00 to buy a revolver that is good enough for shooting a policeman down.

Following these and other like utterances by the defendants Mathias J. Degan was killed in the Haymarket by the explosion of a bomb. After a careful trial, in which the defendants were most ably represented, they were found guilty and the Appellate and Supreme Courts, after great deliberation and careful study and examination of the evidence, confirmed the judgment. Since the abolishment of the distinction between an accessory before the fact and principal, these were plain cases of murder by the oldest, most accepted definition. Sad as their supreme sentence was and always must be to the humane, public opinion has almost unanimously recognized that so long as the death penalty is inflicted for any crime the existence of law and order required it here; and yet annually there are gathered at the graves of these misguided unfortunates a company of men and women who allege that they were hanged unjustly and for a political crime and that

their execution was a violation of the guaranty of the constitution of the right of free speech. They ignore the condition of the guaranty of the Illinois constitution, that "every person may freely speak, write, and publish on all subjects, *being responsible for the abuse of that liberty.*" Similar groups are even now urging like extreme and revolutionary doctrine and propaganda in this and other cities. Not long ago the writer was invited to address an assembly of men and women whom he found to be the true descendants of propagandists of the 80's, preserving with the zeal of vestal virgins the smoldering fires of this their religion of disorder, utter denial of property right or the necessity or desirability of the maintenance of what they term the mere conventionality of marriage. I do not know that there is any menace to the peace and order of society in it, but in all this riotous freedom some lines are beginning to make themselves seen. There is an awakened realization of the importance in the community of an enlightened public opinion; a discovery that moral and religious education which formerly accompanied scientific, literary, and artistic culture under the direction of religion, when education was more or less the province of the church and churchmen, as in England, and as formerly was the case even in this country, has now ceased. By the progress, and it is real progress, that has been made education is practically under the control of the state from the graded to the high school and from the normal school to the university. Provisions deemed essential to the preservation of our form of government have prescribed religious education in the schools and up to now the moral education formerly developed under the co-operation of the churches and the churchmen has found no equivalent or adequate substitute. The generation which is coming up under this changed condition is an experiment. The children of one of our public schools not long ago defied discipline by well-organized strike methods. These boys and girls will shortly direct and constitute the public opinion which shall gauge the moral atmosphere of the future, compose the juries that shall sit in judgment on these questions, and constitute that calm opinion which shall determine the law and measure relatively the moral standards of this in comparison with other nations. This new time imposes on the churches obli-

gations of the gravest nature and raises the question whether it does not require co-operation between all the churches in some such manner as that in which you are here assembled. It was precisely along this line which that great, farsighted educator, President Harper, reasoned when he formulated with others the organization of the Religious Education Association. It was to meet this special need, it was to take advantage of sound co-operation of these great influences and vastly multiply their efficiency by joint action. This inspiration of his was timely and farsighted and ought to be fruitful of advantage to the nation, comparable with that of Charles Eliot Norton at the crisis of the war—that striking instance of the power of the press upon opinion and its wise use. In 1861, when defeats were disheartening the North and Union apathy weighed heavily on the heart of the great President, Professor Norton conceived the plan of conserving and increasing patriotic sentiment and courage. A phenomenal master himself in the command of English and attached to the Union with an ardent devotion, he sought a medium of communication with those like-minded. He organized the Loyal Publication Society of America. It consisted of Professor Norton, director; John Murray Forbes (who so long stood for Chicago in Boston and for Boston in Chicago), fund finder; and Miss Thayer, secretary and office editor. They subscribed for and took all the daily and weekly papers in the United States. With a staff of readers they read them through and selected and reprinted, with acknowledgment of the sources, every loyal ringing courageous editorial. These they mailed free in broadside form (convenient copy for the country editors) to every paper. Accompanying it was the offer of the material for free use in the columns of the receiving paper and the whole was each week reinforced by a special editorial, usually Mr. Norton's own. Presently these editorials began to be republished by the other newspapers throughout the land and so the expression of the loyal opinion of the nation was encouraged and multiplied to an extent no man can measure. "We had one controlling principle," Professor Norton said. "We stood by Lincoln through thick and thin." This simple plan of work persisted in stout-heartedly, with unflinching courage throughout the varying fortunes of that

great controversy, with patient good judgment and unwearied zeal, touched and opened the very fountains of national hope and courage.

No period has made a more urgent call upon the churches, the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations, the sodalities, Christian leagues in schools and universities, church men's clubs and social unions, to supplement the education of the schools. Measure, if you are able to, the full development of education in the West within the lifetime of our university, the developed efficiency of the state universities, and all the graded, high, and normal schools that lead up to them and their progressive correlation, beside the equal growth of private schools. How shall this scientific propaganda be infused with spiritual and moral energy, and how shall our religious life avail itself of the advantages of all this educational and cultural development and scientific growth?

Practical means are being found to curb the evils that attend free speech. The government is scrutinizing with greater care, and will, and should increasingly, the newspapers which are admitted to the mails. The evil, the ignorant, the degenerate should find a boundary where they may not offend public morals. Vicious greed, even in the form of a great newspaper, should be denied any profitable use of the postal service which renders that service offensive to decency. The newspaper which advocates violence or disorder should be held responsible for the act which follows the advice. It is manifestly unfair, as it is illogical, to permit papers to encourage violence and incendiarism and then, when the mob has burned millions of dollars of property as here in the riots of the 70's and 80's, compel the city and the citizens in general to bear the loss. The state guarantees freedom of speech and imposes responsibility for its exercise. Advancing intelligence will require, as Mr. David Dudley Field advocated, that the name of a responsible individual appear for every newspaper registered, and that the name of the writer be put at the foot of every article in which reflection is cast on the character of any person. Its responsibility, penal and financial, are the basis of its right and power. On this responsibility reposes its legal right.

The penalties and influence of the community outside the statute are considerable. As President Hadley recently observed,

The modern newspaper has supplemented the political meeting, the lecture platform, the courts of law, and other institutions as the agent in forming public opinion and the means of educating the average man. . . . We cannot [he well concludes] have responsible and rational government unless we secure a responsible, sober press, and we cannot have such a press unless the readers learn to demand those qualities and resent dishonesty, deception, and unfairness in the newspapers they patronize.

It rests with the community, the men in the pulpit and the patrons of the press to give direction and require control of those multitudinous issues increasingly spread broadcast and out of which comes at last public opinion and the law. By exclusions from the mails, enforcement of severe responsibilities, financial and penal, the enlightenment of public opinion, and discriminating patronage, fit limit is laid down consistent with the advantages of free speech.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: The next writer on this theme is Professor James Q. Dealey, of Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island. Will Mr. Dealey please take the platform?

PROFESSOR JAMES Q. DEALEY, PH.D., Rhode Island, presented the following paper:

#### WHAT ARE THE LEGITIMATE LIMITS OF FREE SPEECH IN A REPUBLIC?

In these days it is not necessary to vindicate, as a principle, the right of free speech. Our forefathers fought out that battle so well that the citizens of every nation enjoying liberty have the right to express their thought freely within reasonable bounds. This freedom implies not simply the right to speak in public and private but also the right to use the press and the mails for the broader dissemination of thought.

Naturally there are variations in the amount of liberty granted in different parts of the world, but this variation is not determined by the form of government but by local conditions, since there are monarchies freer than some republics. The term republic,

however, as used in the question before us, implies a government of comparatively liberal institution like our own, with a trend in the direction of larger freedom.

Our constitutions, national and local, expressly guarantee to us freedom of speech, and what few limitations there are may be found embodied in acts and statutes in respect to libel, slander, and conspiracy. The courts in their decisions distinguish between liberty and license, and hold to the principle that no citizen through his freedom has the right to injure his fellow, or to disturb the public peace. The presumption is always in favor of freedom, so that even when a citizen is nearer license than liberty he is assumed to be innocent of evil intent, and is given the benefit of nine points in the law. Juries hesitate to convict even in gross forms of license, such as incitement to violence and the circulation of obscene literature. Though such offenses are unlawful and against the peace and good morals of the state, they are more usually left to be dealt with by public opinion, in preference to fine or imprisonment. This latitude of course finds further expression in our legal recognition of privileged persons and places, as, for instance, the greater freedom of speech permissible in halls of legislation and justice, and to a less extent in political campaigns. Using this principle of the law as a basis for comparison, we can now consider whether it also holds true in that large sphere of social life not covered by the law. The principle, it will be remembered, assumes freedom of speech, with few limitations, these limitations being neutralized in the case of privileged persons and places, and rarely enforced against others.

This principle of freedom, it should be said, is in quite full accord with sociological teaching. In rude civilization there are numerous prohibitions on individual conduct, and these are enforced by stern punishment. As civilization advances, these *tabus* of all sorts give place to regulations, and these grow less detailed as progress is made. In higher civilizations regulations are generalized, and attention devoted to the development of a type of personality that will need neither prohibition nor regulation. In a free republic, as all men are by theory capable of comprehending their rights and obligations, prohibitions and



regulations of speech almost reach the vanishing point, for free men should have free speech. Even though a few unused to freedom should misuse their privilege, we deem it wiser to let them do so, than to place irksome restrictions on the many who use their freedom with moderation. As a general proposition it is deemed wiser to allow men to voice their grievances than to suppress them. Some men are like some women; the more freely they are allowed to talk of their griefs, the happier they become.

Although our political fathers, under the influence of the idealism of the eighteenth century, wisely placed this principle of freedom in the constitution, it is somewhat doubtful whether even yet public opinion is prepared to apply it to all aspects of life, except in purely academic questions. Suppose, for example, that a person should learnedly argue that neither Shakspeare nor Bacon, but Queen Elizabeth, wrote the Shaksperian plays, the literary world would be interested, possibly amused, but the writer of the new theory would run no risk of being asked to resign. If, by contrast, a man avows a belief in economic heresies, shall we say "free silver" for example, let him beware; even a college president can hardly do that with impunity. Can a man openly confess himself to be in politics an anarchist or a socialist, and maintain his place in what we may euphemistically call "respectable society"? Does not an atheist suffer in social estimation because of his belief? May a person hold "advanced views" in respect to marriage and divorce, or advocate moderate drinking, and maintain a reputation for religion and morality? Yet presumably a man might hold all of these or similar heresies, and remain a good man, an excellent citizen, and be religious at heart.

Now the reason for the failure to apply the principle of free speech to those aspects of life not covered by the law seems clear enough, when one takes into account the economic conditions of life and the natural inertia of the human mind. If a man is hired by a corporation, he is not supposed to exercise his freedom of speech by criticizing its methods or working against its interests. He has that privilege if he will first resign. By analogy this hired-man theory is made to apply to other occupations also. Any

person who receives compensation for services is a hired man. A politician therefore must not criticize the party that gives him office; the minister or theological teacher must work for his denomination; the editor must not voice his own opinions but those of the management; the college teacher must not express any views that may hinder endowments or deprive the institution of patronage. No one of these must acknowledge that the goods sold over the counter of the opposition, are to be compared in quality with the excellent "embalmed beef" he is hired to sell. Presumably a certain amount of this sort of thing is inevitable and necessary. In a transitional age of civilization like this, when the old and the new exist side by side, each may well insist on its right to survive and take proper precautions to that end. Furthermore many persons are well satisfied to be hired on such conditions. Life is a constant struggle at best, and an assured pay-day deadens radicalism and heresy. If, therefore, a person is plainly hired to teach a set of teachings, or to advocate a certain policy as against rival systems, he should do so or resign. By contract he surrendered his right to free thought, and he has no business to claim that and his salary besides. Free speech and hire are incompatible, and a man must choose which he wants.

But the human mind readily adjusts itself to beliefs allied with financial returns; a person who desires his wage and the appearance of freedom too should try to persuade himself that he is holding great principles taught by better and wiser men in the past. The shibboleth of party platform, historic creed, and accepted truth, is always a popular test of capacity, and a man can get a greater reputation for intellectuality by teaching the old than by advocating the new. A person in fact can do this sort of thing without conscious deception. The mind often seems to be free when it is really a slave to environment. If a person is trained to routine and fixed beliefs, and his mentality molded to what may be found in print or in commonly accepted customs and traditions, his thought is mere repetition, his mind works in grooves, and cannot get out of its accustomed ruts. Yet he seems to think, he thinks he is thinking, and he probably supposes that he has thought out his conclusions, which singularly enough harmonize with those of other great men he has studied

about. But why cast stones? Perhaps we all live in glass houses and the subject had better be changed.

Yet it seems a pity that this hired-man theory should be made applicable to the intellectual life at least. Admit that in the present stress and strain of economic life through sheer necessity men must frequently forget their freedom, and like soldiers serve without hesitation or question. Does it follow that the same compulsion is to hold in higher occupations? Should a responsible political officer be a slave to his constituency and to his party's platform? Is a minister *hired* by a church, and is he bound to preach denominational teachings only? Should a teacher assume that he is paid merely to teach conventional knowledge, or what an executive board may hint that he should teach? Should a judge in his decisions aim to please either trades unions or capitalistic interests by a squinting construction of the law? Should an editor of a great daily favor a man he despises, and advocate a policy he believes to be wrong? Is there such a thing as mental prostitution, worthy of greater condemnation under the principle of *noblesse oblige*? Certainly if the hired-man theory is to hold in these occupations, limitations innumerable will be placed on freedom of speech and the leaders of public opinion will be proclaiming "peace, peace, when there is no peace." Perhaps, however, our real anxiety should arise not from the case of the petty man who works for hire, nor from the great thinker whose opinions carry weight whenever expressed, but rather in respect to those who are too great to be petty and yet must fight for the right of freedom against those who consider them to be hired men. Their names do not carry a prestige that would win ultimate support against temporary loss, and when they become radical or heretical, it is difficult for an institution to be generous, since there is a tangible loss to balance against a problematical gain. Undoubtedly in many such cases the speaker is suppressed; he is quietly warned that his views are obnoxious, and that he better re-examine his arguments before he again announces his conclusions. Should he refuse to be amenable to suggestion, his salary may be reduced as a hint, he may be charged with a desire for notoriety, or his resignation may be demanded. These measures are usually effective. As a rule the

thinker is not great enough to rise above the storm he has made and he sinks into insignificance, broken and defeated. Shall we say that truth has been vindicated or the reverse? Unquestionably all such suppression is *prima facie* unjust. Not simply is the victim suppressed but scores of others, also, who fear to take the consequences of a stand like his. Peace has been secured, but at the price of liberty, established truth and institutionalism have been safeguarded, but at the expense of ultimate larger truth and a purified institutional life.

Yet as against a freedom limited by economic considerations there is a real freedom. Arrayed against the mercenary and the time-server is the man who is free because his speech is free. In economic life he works for the firm with his thought and conscience, and has the right within the business to protest against dishonest methods. In political office he serves his country, not his party; in the pulpit, his God, not a church; in the editor's or teacher's chair he proclaims the truth as he understands it, even though it may not harmonize with local or other interests. Such men may suffer reproach or hardship, or may seriously damage and even destroy a business, or a party's prospects, or the prosperity of a church or a college, but what of it? The occasional wreck and ruin of a petty interest, or the martyrdom of an individual, is amply atoned for by the idealism and thought contributed to society by men who are really free. It is far better to maintain freedom in life, even at the risk of monetary loss or human suffering. Freedom must be purchased with blood and anguish but it is worth the cost.

Surely in the mental world, when men receive compensation for services, there should be no suspicion of slavery in the contract. Free thought is too precious a heritage to weigh against dollars and cents. An institution or church that purchases its existence at the cost of freedom might better die for liberty and let thought be free. This should be true, even though we know that every thinker in his conclusions will present a mingled mass of truth, half truth, and error. Oh that men, when they think, would think truth only! But even though liberty may seem to become license, it is far better to adopt the practice of the law and not be too eager to bring railing accusations. Our prophets

and martyrs have always been put to death by the established order in the name of liberty and religion, and it may be that those we are most sure are wrong will be listed as great men when we are forgotten. Christ who would not call down fire from heaven on the village that had refused to receive him, and Gamaliel who advised against persecution lest they prove to be fighting against God, both believed that truth is its own best defender and needs no fallible censor who would burn wheat with the tares. If error is expressed, resist it with a larger truth, but never with threat and insinuation and excommunication. We, at least, citizens of the United States and members of bodies that believe in the freedom of the individual conscience, should be more afraid of an *index expurgatorius* than of "modernism."

But even if one were to grant the largest liberty to thinkers, there are still some natural limitations. The crank in due time goes to his own place, ignorance may grow wiser with age, and if greater men should utter teachings that to some or to many might seem immoral, untrue, and subversive of social order, the remedy lies not in a threat to withdraw economic support, but in the pressure of public opinion. Every man desires the approval of his class; the theologian desires the approval of his brethren, the scientist, of his fellows, and the philosopher, of other thinkers. Whatever others may think, he desires that these at least approve him. He might even be pleased at other opposition, provided his professional brothers approved his stand, if not his views. Rarely will a man run counter to his natural allies and defy public opinion *en masse*; but if he does, if he stands up before the world on platform or in pulpit or professional chair, and challenges the very foundations of belief and morality, let us not gnash at him with our teeth, for he speaks in a privileged place and is a privileged person. Whether he be fool or prophet we may not know, but if arraigned at all, he should be arraigned before the bar of reason, and not before executive committee or ecclesiastical council.

It is possible that questions of this sort would never arise if thinkers and institutions would adopt the scientific attitude of mind. In science all truth is relative, and a law or principle accepted today may be rejected tomorrow. Each scientist holds

his views subject to amendment or revision when necessity arises, nor has he a single teaching the truth of which may not be called in question. Under such conditions every new theory arouses interest; its reasonableness is looked at from many points of view, it may be attacked with acrimony and resisted by despairing men who see their pet theories threatened. It is, however, a battle of reason and facts, the best argument wins, and the loser himself advocates the winning hypothesis and starts over again in his search for truth.

By contrast, when a person assumes the perfection of law and government, or of family, church, or party, and argues that everything in opposition to the existing system is immoral, wicked, and subversive of the truth, he naturally prefers that there be some limitations on that kind of free speech, that seems to threaten the stability of his theoretically perfect system. Limitations on free speech are unnecessary when truth is in question. The need for new and better truth today is so clear that it is safer to give complete freedom, insisting merely that the discussion be free from vituperation, and that the participants have open minds; even when the newer teaching seems by implication to be immoral, it is better to prove it to be so than to indulge in denunciation; for newer truths often seem immoral to defenders of the old, who fail to see that a good may be opposed by a better.

The real remedy for license is not suppression, nor the multiplicity of limitation and regulation, but a generous policy of freedom, a love for truth wherever it may lead, and vigorous attempts to develop a type of personality, whose beliefs will not depend so much on distorted intellectualism or emotionalism, as on sterling character, trained intellect, and spiritual insight.

It is likely that we need to work away from the hired-man theory in our churches more than anywhere else. The college world has won for itself a fair amount of freedom; men like our President Roosevelt and Governor Hughes are not uncommon in political life; judges on the bench maintain as a whole a reputation for fairness in their decisions; and there is a free press, as well as a mercenary and a "yellow" journalism.

But in churches conditions are too often different. The ethics of church management is based on a theory of competition, not co-

operation and essential unity. There are so many churches that competition for membership and support is keen. There is a struggle for existence, and each in place of considering itself as an instrument for the attainment of larger ends, assumes that it is an end of itself, often to the neglect of more important needs. It therefore insists that its minister should work for its interests irrespective of larger demands, even though, as in Roman legend, it is often better to kill than to save, if a nobler purpose is thereby attained. The minister, accordingly, must devote himself to the task of building up the material interests of his church, and he expects promotion in proportion to his capacity to increase membership and income. This competitive struggle may to an extent be necessary, but the intensity of it belittles religious ideals and leads to expurgated teachings, since the more one tries to please the many, the more platitudinal must be his thought. Am I rash in saying that our highest and freest thought in the main comes today from sources other than the churches? Admitting as one should the useful work performed by the churches in teaching conventional morals and religion, is there not truth in the charge that the mass of the religious world views with suspicion its great leaders in thought, and casts out from its fellowship the newer movements in religion? If this be true, is it not because the average minister himself fails to think or to teach the larger thought of the times? "Like priest, like people": on one side his church urges him to consider local interests, on the other his religious leaders whip him into line for denominational interests, and if, perchance, he strays into other denominational pastures and finds the grass as good as the blue grass of Kentucky, his brethren shake their heads sadly and ask whether he studied theology at Union or Chicago.

Is not after all the demand for limitations on free speech in matters of religious belief due to the fact that ecclesiasticism and denominationalism have dethroned religion and set the form above the spirit? It is said that the last years of Sankey's noble life were embittered through the feelings aroused by his change of denomination. Like many others he had come to believe that the name of the regiment made small difference as long as it carried the national flag. Far better would it be if we could forget

during the remainder of the century all of our denominational differences, and, as idealists, exalt instead the great fundamental truths of a world religion that would ultimately bind in vital union the best spiritual life of the Orient and the Occident. I strongly suspect that if our churches for the next hundred years neglected to teach dogmatism and fixed systems of theology, and preferably federated themselves for the Christianizing of social conditions throughout the world, the gates of St. Peter would swing open just as widely and as often as now, and our children's children would be freed from an incubus that deadens Christian energy, and makes each church an arena for competitive struggle with kindred yet rival organizations.

In conclusion, may it not be that in order to save denominationalism we have placed too many limitations on religious liberty; and that even the body that through Roger Williams proclaimed on this hemisphere the doctrine of liberty, is not over-zealous in behalf of its offspring? When a brainy young man considers in these confusing times the claims of the ministry he hesitates long at the prospect. Our seminaries are more noted for their orthodoxy than for their breadth, and three years spent in such an atmosphere is not attractive; nor is the thought of the ordination council and its demands any more cheering; nor recognition services, fellowships, and the "approval of the brethren," so often negatively expressed by the shrug and the insinuation of unsoundness in the faith. Is it strange that men with a message and a vision turn aside for other ways, and leave the beaten path so often to the hired man? Stand by the principle of freedom, lessen rather than increase limitations, and while there may be some license mixed with liberty, there will also be wisdom and prophecy.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We are now to listen to two appointed speakers: first, Rev. Bayard Craig, D.D., of Denver, Colo.

REV. BAYARD CRAIG, D.D. (Disciple), Denver, Colorado:

Not being a lawyer it will be impossible for me to discuss this question in a technical way. In this matter I am a layman. I am looking at the question from the standpoint of the citizen, and will talk about it in a common-sense way rather than as a lawyer. (Laughter.)



The question, "What are the legitimate limits of free speech in a republic?" has but little to do with free speech in a religious convention or among students in university life, but in a republic as large as this, twice as large as this, with a great mass of ignorant people, with a great mass of criminal people, unrestrained speech of the evil-minded may work widespread devastation.

In a republic or under any form of government, individual freedom must be restricted; it must be held within the bounds of good citizenship. Our Constitution declares that no law shall be passed restraining the right of freedom of speech or of the press; nevertheless in this republic we have found it necessary to provide limitations. We do not permit the free man in the republic the unrestrained use of his property: he may not make his property a nuisance; he may not interfere with the rights of his neighbor; he may not use his property in a way to disturb the common peace of the common welfare. We do not permit him the unlimited use of his own person: he may not steal, he may not go naked in the streets, he may not commit an indecency.

For like reasons we restrain his freedom of speech. All weapons are in the hands of the orator. All the resources of men may be commanded by the orator for evil as well as for good, and we justly put limitations on the use of his great power.

It has been said here tonight that the Fathers had fought out this question. I think not. It is one thing to provide a republican form of government for a few millions of people burning with patriotism, and under the inspiration of that patriotism seeking to promote the common good. It is quite another thing to provide a democratic government for 80,000,000 or 100,000,000 people no longer purified by a flaming patriotism, when all evil passions assert themselves and where the very leaders of the people, led by lust of gold into a debased commercialism, lead the people by evil example into wrong paths. No, there are problems that we will have to fight out in this, our day.

We ought to remember also that a republic is peculiarly indulgent to the right of free speech. Lovers of liberty devised the republic to promote individual freedom. Through a thousand

years they fought hopelessly against the autocrat and the privileged classes, but their love for liberty was so relentless that a thousand years of defeat could not daunt them; they went on for another thousand years until they achieved the republic. When it was achieved, they realized that the weapon by which they had won was free speech and a free press. It is not strange then that the right of free speech should become the pet child of the republic; not strange that it should have a foremost place in the Bill of Rights for every would-be free man; and as free speech made the birth of the republic possible, we have learned by experience that free speech is also essential to its continued life and progress.

No republic is born perfect; it must learn to amend its constitution and improve its laws by the wisdom of experience, and free speech is necessary to a wholesome discussion that will lead to the discovery of wise remedies for the difficulties that may have developed and for the solution of new problems that rise to vex the people. As the right of free speech is thus found necessary to the birth and continued life of the republic it will be cherished and guarded with peculiar care. The republic is much more likely to be too indulgent in the matter of free speech than too strict in the matter of limitations.

Lawyers and lawmakers must formulate laws restrictive of free speech. I have some land out in the Rocky Mountains; I want to fence it. A part of it is fenced naturally by precipices of rock; in other places there are passes that must be carefully guarded. I do not expect to build the fence; I expect to give only general directions and let somebody else attend to the details. In this difficult subject it is enough to point out in a general way where limitations are needed as suggested by the history of the republic.

The government in its structure, its laws, and in the person of its representatives needs protection from the destructive speech of its own bad citizens. Any individual has the right to protect his own life; how much greater the right of a government to protect itself when the welfare of so many millions are involved in its stability!

The unrestrained speech of the anarchist and dangerous

fanatic has again and again caused riot and bloodshed in America, dire results that might have been averted by adequate and prompt legal restraint. We passed some stringent laws after the assassination of President McKinley and we had learned at an earlier date to apply limitations in the case of the Chicago anarchists. Our people are well satisfied that these limitations came none too soon and wise students of the situation anticipate still more stringent limitations to help control our ever-increasing criminal and dangerous people.

If Absalom's freedom of speech had been checked in time the kingdom of David might have been spared the revolution and Absalom have saved his own reckless life.

The government should be protected in the person of its representatives at home and abroad. Our courts are safe from the abuse of free speech that would destroy their standing and efficiency. Something of the same protection should be extended to all high government officers not to protect them from just criticism but, from the insults and abuse of the malicious and evil-minded.

The individual should be protected. The individual in the republic must give up much because his individual right is subordinate to the common good; but he has certain rights that should be carefully protected by the republic. The Englishman has made his house his castle. A citizen can claim no less in a republic. He ought to be protected in his home and private life; it ought to be free from invasion, even from the American enterprising newspaper reporter. I am not blaming the reporter nor am I blaming the editor that under the conditions of his times seeks to build up his paper as the laws and public sentiment permit. I am thinking of an ideal republic, and in that ideal republic I do not believe my fellow-citizen should have the privilege of laying in a stock of white paper, putting in a printing press and then, in order that he might sell that paper to the greatest possible advantage, send a reporter into my home to exploit private affairs in the life of myself or my family that are within the bounds of law, that do not concern the public, that would not benefit the public by publicity, but only add to the pain or humiliation or annoyance of the family circle invaded.

I know it is claimed the newspaper must have "news." We need a carefully considered definition of that technical term, "news," or it is likely soon to rival the word "liberty" as a shield for wrong. Commercial greed has no right to seize on a neighbor's private property in some sacred family incident because it can be converted into a good story and satisfy prurient curiosity.

A limitation is also needed to protect the people from the poison in the tongue of the bad citizen who would abuse the right of free speech. Back of the form of government is the great throbbing mass of humanity with their passions, their appetites, desires, activities and all that goes to make up their varied life. This great mass of people generate that potent thing we know as public sentiment. Public sentiment is the controlling power in a republic. It formulates the written laws and regulates by its unwritten laws. It is a great stream fed by a thousand rivulets and springs. The stream may be clear and wholesome or polluted and poisonous. The sources that feed the stream are the home, the school, the college, the church, the theater, the fraternal lodge-room, and above all in effect—the newspapers.

The health of the republic depends on the purity of public sentiment. To keep that sentiment pure its sources should be guarded. Free speech and a free press have a controlling influence in generating public sentiment; abused, they may lower the tone and destroy the high ideals essential to the life and welfare of the community. How can we maintain right ideals concerning the home and good morals if the theater makes a heroine of the prostitute?

Can good citizens in an ideal republic afford to be careless as to the effect the playhouse and the newspaper and these other sources that I have spoken of have on the formation of a right public sentiment? If they are poisoning public sentiment, there is a demand for some sort of a corrective. Whether that corrective shall be found by putting up the truth against the error, or whether it be found in formulated laws is not so important, so protection is accomplished.

How can we hope to maintain high ideals of life and living on the part of people, if the editors of our papers are permitted to rake the muck heaps of the world and supply their findings

for the daily mental bread of the people? How can we hope to maintain a correct and high public sentiment when the people's minds are filled with suggestions of evil in their daily readings of the scandals, vices, and crimes of the world?

I know the answer! It is said the people get just the newspaper that they want, just the plays that they ask for. Wouldn't it be truer to say that perverted appetite grows by what it feeds upon? The dealer in cigarettes creates the appetite that demands cigarettes; the dealer in drugs—morphine and cocaine and all other pernicious drugs—creates the appetite that he finally feeds. In old Rome they fed the people with the slaughter of the arena and the people learned to love the taste of blood and demanded that sort of entertainment. If we feed the people on the things that are mean and scandalous and vile and criminal, we create an appetite that demands that kind of food. Proper limitations would prevent the stream of public sentiment from thus becoming perverted to the injury of public morals and the structure of society.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We have just one more address to-night, and I am sure you will make a mistake if you go away before you hear the thoughtful and eloquent young pastor from Buffalo. I ask you to keep your seats if you will and listen for the few moments to be occupied in his address.

REV. CARL D. CASE, PH.D. (Baptist), Buffalo, N. Y.:

It is peculiarly fitting that the subject assigned should be discussed in a Baptist Congress. Nowhere else in the denomination is there such opportunity for unlimited free speech as here. As was said in the joint conference this afternoon, nothing is too sacred for us to consider. This privilege has, indeed, been the heritage of the past into which all three denominations represented here, the Disciples, Free Baptists, and Baptists, have entered. John Locke—to make a familiar quotation—has declared that "Baptists were the first and only expounders of absolute liberty, just and true liberty, equal and impartial liberty." And it was Milton who said: "Give me liberty to know, to utter, to argue freely according to conscience, above all other liberties;" and this was said in his fight against the efforts of the Star

Chamber at press restriction. At the beginning of his *Areopagitica* he quotes from Euripides to say:

This is true liberty, when free-born men  
Having to advise the public may speak free,  
Which he who can, and will, deserves high praise;  
Who neither can nor will may hold his peace,  
What can be juster in a state than this?

There are certain implications in the statement of the subject. The first is that there is a contrast between free speech and a free press. Mr. Heckman's treatment this evening of the necessary limitations of a free press has given great assistance in the answer of the question before us. The newspaper is supposed to be able to print what the private individual could not promulgate. But technically, before the law, there is no such distinction, except that action may be taken on written words without special proof of damage done and written words are treated with special rigor. There is a greater power in the press than in mere speech, and free speech derives its greatest effectiveness in a free press. The limitations, therefore, of the press may in general be applied to speech.

The second implication in the statement of the subject is that free speech is a source of danger. Both repression and expression are dangerous, and the question is how to keep from the one extreme of slander and treason and the other of ignorance and slavery. Yet all freedom is dangerous. It is, in fact, dangerous to live. We must resolutely find the proper limits of speech and such limits are called "legitimate." This does not mean of necessity legal, but it does not mean equitable. President Roosevelt's comparison in one of his campaign letters between law and equity is illuminating. Business men are needed who will do more than to conduct their business according to the strict interpretation of the law. Equity is always higher than law. The limits of free speech which are legitimate may not be set by statute but may nevertheless be as morally binding, and may be as effectively enforced, as Professor Dealey tonight has so well shown, by public sentiment and opinion.

The third implication of the topic is that the subject of free speech has a special relevancy in a republic. This is especially

true in a republic like ours in which we have a mixed population and such heterogeneous elements. But this condition which need not be a permanent one, is not of the essence of democracy. There is also the party system of America which may or may not be essential to a republic. There are three important characteristics of a republic which have special reference to the topic: that the will of the people is absolute, that public officials are public servants, and that the will of the majority is right. The tremendous assumption is in the third statement which practically means that *vox populi* is *vox dei*. But all of these characteristics demand at least some free speech. The will of the people needs to be based upon intelligence, the deeds of the public official must be discussed, the individual who helps to form the majority must be trained.

Agreeing thoroughly with the last speaker that there must theoretically be the limitations which he proposes, I should object to any enforcement of such rigid ideals lest more harm than good result. Let the people cease buying yellow journals and yellow journals will cease to exist. At the beginning of my study, I felt strongly that the necessary limits should be emphatically presented. I am more inclined now to treat the subject from the side of an unlimited free speech, except in so far as such free speech is immoral, slanderous, and treasonable. I have four reasons to present.

First, unlimited free speech is an essential to the education of the individual citizen. A political campaign sends the whole nation to college. Every store and office becomes a seminar of political science. Of course there are dangers in too great liberty of speech. There is the danger that the man of wrong motives may confuse the mind of the voter. There is also the danger that in the midst of opposing opinions, the mind shall be bewildered. But the remedy for these evils is not less but more free speech. There is also the danger of what Mr. James Bryce calls the "fatalism of the multitude," which leads to the "tyranny of the majority." There is a loss of individualism. There is a feeling that the majority must be right. Perhaps Mr. Bryce would not make the same statement today as when he wrote the *American Commonwealth*. Certainly the custom of splitting the ticket,

of changing party for special issues, of selecting men irrespective of party, is growing. Never was this more pronounced, and especially in my own state of New York, than in the last election. The French representative with our army at Santiago said that the characteristic of the American soldier was his initiative. It is the development of the individual initiative that will keep the American people more and more from voting a certain ticket simply to be with the majority.

Free speech is educative and looks to the future. It presupposes a progressive government, and a republic must either be progressive or die. The difference between an absolute monarchy and a republic is the difference between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. The one faces the past and yields to the authority of yesterday. The other faces the future and is waiting for the new light of tomorrow. The principle of Protestantism is not an infallible book over against an infallible church but the principle of absolute individual independence in the investigation of truth and its immediate and practical application to life. Therefore Protestantism must progress. Our own republic has advanced rapidly in the last eight years, not because alone we had a vigorous president, but because freedom of speech has illuminated the public mind and the public voice has given its approval. The only way in a republic by which new problems secure speedy solution, and new principles become either living law or dead issues in one campaign, is by free speech. Free speech is the emery wheel to grind off the alloy from the gem of truth; it is the chemical reagent to precipitate convictions in the fluid thought of the public; it is the telescope to aid us in seeing the star of hope.

Second, unlimited free speech is a necessity to the mutual understanding and sympathy of various classes of the government. Legislators must be equable. Labor and capital must be better acquainted. North and South must get together. The Disciples and Baptists must meet in such assemblies as this. The remedy for misunderstandings, even when caused by speech, is not less but more free speech.

Third, free speech is essential as the only permanent antitoxin against tyranny. Napoleon muzzled free speech. The Czar, a



few years ago, gave a list of topics in which he commanded all Russian editors to be silent. Cromwell said, "My government is not worth preservation if it cannot stand against paper shot;" and yet twice, of his tyranny, he sent a satirist to court to be tried as a libeler. There is a constant tendency of those in power to hold this position at all hazards. There is danger both of blinded vision and blunted conscience. Free speech means watchfulness on the part of the people and fearfulness on the part of the rulers. It means information requested and information discussed, and information judged.

Fourth, unlimited free speech is essential to allay social unrest. There is indeed a grave danger here that free speech may arouse social unrest and create mistrust and suspicion. It is proper to comment on matters of public concern, but "slander, meanest spawn of hell," as Tennyson puts it, makes reputation a plaything. The imputation of base motives is degrading. We feel that Napoleon was right in saying: "A printing-house is a powder magazine into which every fool must not be allowed to enter." There is often such gross misrepresentation, such poisoning of the public mind. And there is no real redress. No retraction can undo the damage done. The suspicion remains, and many do not hear of the retraction, and still, even this misuse of free speech can only be met effectively by free speech. Let others also speak, and the comparison of vituperation with sober judgment will be as black to white. If government is right, it will bear investigation. If it objects to free speech, the presumption is that something is wrong. Anarchy is generally due to a policy of repression, as instance Russia in comparison with England. Anarchy is not indigenous to a republic.

In a republic, the man who discusses a lost issue is laughed at. In a repressive monarchy he might be a martyr. It is a great stock in trade that Eugene Debs has been in prison. In this morning's paper, President Gompers, of the American Federation of Labor, is reported as presenting to his organization a full account of certain injunction proceedings, although the court had forbidden him to refer to it either in writing or spoken words.

He says that he may be at once cited for contempt of court. Nothing could be better for Mr. Gompers' cause. To be arrested

would be a stronger argument for his contention than any verbal statement he could make. But such arrest would be a serious mistake for the cause of truth. Mr. Bryce in his *American Commonwealth* puts this idea into the following words:

Under a repressive government, the sense of grievance and injustice fans the flame of resistance in a persecuted minority. But in a country like this, where the freedom of the press, the right of public meeting, and the right of association and agitation have been legally extended and are daily exerted more widely than anywhere else in the world, there is nothing to awaken that sense. He whom the multitude condemns or ignores has no further court of appeal to look to. Rome has spoken. His cause has been heard and judgment has gone against him.

Here are two examples to illustrate the truth of this contention. Dario Papa of Italy, who had been an ardent admirer of republicanism, though a converted Republican, chiefly through influence from America, was to make a speech to the assembled people in one of the theaters of Milan. A telegram came from Crispi's government to the local authorities not to permit the meeting. The authorities replied that it would make less trouble to let the meeting go on; that the people wanted to hear Papa. The reply came that though he should be allowed to speak, the censor must sit on the platform and stop him if he said anything against the monarchy. Papa described in detail the sufferings of the people and at last said: "And all this we owe to the house of Savoy!" The censor went across the stage and touched the speaker's arm warningly; but Papa continued: "And you all see that I am forbidden by this representative of the house of Savoy to say that all this we owe to the house of Savoy." No one can be blind to the fact that the cause of the government would have been served far better if no censor had been at the meeting.

The other illustration is from our own country. John Turner, an immigrant, was arrested in 1903, and imprisoned at Ellis Island on the charge of being an anarchist. Not that he had advocated violence. All he had said in a hall in New York City was that he advised a general strike. But he was called an anarchist because he belonged to an association of anarchists, and the law describes an anarchist as one "who disbelieves in or who is opposed to all organized government, or who is a member of

or affiliated with any organization entertaining or teaching such belief in opposition to all government." At once a great mass-meeting was held in New York and able leaders and speakers took part. Ernest Crosby, in an article in the *North American Review*, compared Turner with Peter Kropatkin, Henrik Ibsen, and Leo Tolstoy as theoretical anarchists, and John Turner, whom otherwise few would have noticed, at once became a public martyr and hero whose name was on the lips of all.

Such are the claims of an unlimited free speech. What about securing those limits which all acknowledge are legitimate, not by law, but by public opinion? The English audiences are quick at expressing their disapproval in a public meeting when the discourse is not intelligent or the speaking descends to mere party glorification; and they know how to hiss as well as applaud. After all, there are no limits to free speech except as immoral or treasonable, and then only as manifestly so. The limit to free speech must be free speech. The antidote to a free speech of license is a free speech of sanity. Let all be free to speak, and all be free to dissent. What we want is the quick expression of the moral forces of the nation. Where money and political preferment do not induce free speech, let patriotism and the love of righteousness.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: I have now the pleasure of introducing to you the second Vice-President of this Congress, who will lead us in the closing prayer, President Joseph W. Mauck, LL.D., of Hillsdale, Mich.

Prayer having been offered, the Congress adjourned to reconvene on Wednesday, November 11, 1908, at 2:30 o'clock P. M.

## SECOND DAY

### *Afternoon Session*

November 11, 1908

2:30 o'clock, P. M.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: The hour has arrived for opening this afternoon session. Let us sing three verses of Hymn No. 459, the first, fifth, and sixth stanzas: "All Hail the Power of Jesus' Name."

(The Congress rose and joined in singing the hymn)

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We will be led in prayer by Dr. Greene, of Evanston.

(Dr. B. A. Greene, of Evanston, Ill., led the Congress in prayer)

PRESIDENT JACKSON: Our theme for study this afternoon is "The Doctrine of Atonement in Terms of Modern Thought." The first writer is Rev. B. A. Jenkins, D.D., Kansas City, Mo. Will Mr. Jenkins please step forward and occupy the platform?

REV. B. A. JENKINS, D.D. (Disciple), Kansas City, Mo., submitted the following paper:

### THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT IN TERMS OF MODERN THOUGHT

Dr. George Gordon says that the age is without a definite and systematized theology. And I think most of us will agree that he is right. Old things have passed away, and all things have not yet become new. Time was when a theological student could choose his system: calvinistic, Armenian, what not, and have it all lined out for him, ready-made and complete. It was a case of pay your money and take your choice. That day has passed. The professor's chair no longer declares: "This is the doctrine. All other views are false." Instead, it says: "We are feeling our way along this line. It is in this general direction that the truth lies, we think." Indeed there is no such thing as the New Theology. It is not yet born. The age is in travail with it still.

So it is, in my judgment, with this question of the atonement. The old conceptions, so neatly and systematically sawn, planed, jointed, so easy of statement and of comprehension, are no longer capable of containing the modern mind. Its free-winged spirit scorns in such scant borders to be spanned. We have not yet solved this problem. Probably we never shall, completely. One element of religion lies in mystery. But certainly the older theories have become inadequate, and the age is feeling its way after some more rational, if tentative, statement.

As soon as Christian thought, in the earliest centuries, began to formulate doctrines in a more expanded shape than the simple words of Scripture, it reached the conclusion, upon this question of the atonement, that Christ was delivered as a ransom to Satan to purchase man's immunity from sin and from its consequences. Men were the real possessions of Satan, and God bought their freedom with the person of Christ. For the first ten centuries, roughly stating, this was the accepted doctrine of the church. In some quarters it has even been accepted ten centuries later.

It was in the eleventh century that Anselm modified the doctrine, and mollified it, to this extent, that the ransom was paid by Jesus not to Satan but to God. He considered that satisfaction was due to God from man, before man could be relieved of the consequences of his sin. In view of the enormity of man's guilt, and in view of the greatness of God, no sum could be paid that was not equal to the dignity and power of God himself. As none was the equal of God, he himself became man that he might, in his infinite mercy offer to himself a fitting discharge of the debt.

At the time of the Reformation, a still further modification was presented. As Anselm's view was couched in terms of commercial law, so the Reformers' was declared in terms of criminal law. The satisfaction owed to God was punishment. Suffering, penal suffering, must be endured by someone to satisfy the outraged justice of God. Christ undertook to endure it; and he bore the penalty for all sins of all men, in all time, even, as some of them held, the sufferings of hell.

A later view that has even been taught within the past generation in one great New England Seminary that I know of, is the governmental view that the majesty of God's law must needs

be maintained, that it had been outraged by man's sin, and that Jesus took upon himself to suffer the vindication of the law, in behalf of man.

Of these various mechanical, legal, commercial, hard-and-fast views, Horace Bushnell long ago said: "The lean kine of judicial satisfaction have devoured the good kine of God's regenerative bounty." And elsewhere he remarks the difficulty that those who maintain the judicial, legislative, or substitutionary theories have to maintain themselves within their doctrine. They *will* get beyond it, and revel occasionally in such texts as "The love of Christ constraineth us;" "Christ liveth in me;" "God commendeth his love toward us in that while we are sinners," etc., etc. So, though they hold to the fierce anger of God, inextinguishable except by a victim, their hearts are better.

Bushnell, by the way, is an instance of those thinkers who, now and then, since the Middle Ages, in reaction from the mechanical theories current in their day, have swung to what may be called the moral influence theory, viz., that Christ's work was a revelation of God's heart of goodness, purity, and love, intended not to appease God himself, since he did not need it, nor to buy off Satan since his ownership was at least limited, but to win man to repentance and to love for God.

Bushnell adds: "No doctrine of the atoning or reconciling work of Christ has ever yet been developed that can be said to have received the consent of the Christian world." And he believes that the final doctrine will emerge at the point of "the moral view," and be concluded there.

I am not at all sure but that this moral view, this purely ethical theory of the atoning work of Christ, would find more votaries among the men of today who are imbued with the modern spirit, than would any more theological conception. I am not sure but that the reaction has been so great from the old legalistic conceptions that we have swung to the other extreme of a purely prophetic and ethical mission for the great Teacher of Nazareth. We have so changed our view of God from governor and king; we have so revolted at the conception of "Sinners in the hand of an angry God;" we have so altered our interpretation of the Hebrew phrase: "The Lord our God is a jealous God visiting

the sins of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation;" we have so turned and tied to the interpretation of God as to that of Father and loving Lord, that we can no longer accept the governmental theories. And yet no doctrine has been evolved which meets acceptance at the hands of the time-spirit. We have, furthermore, so altered our view of Scripture, under the modern criticism, and under the new method of biblical theology, that we no longer expect a uniform view of the work of Christ among all the New Testament writers, but rather diversified views from different writers who ponder upon the same facts. Our danger therefore is, is it not, that we shall be left without any view other than that Christ's work was like that of any great and good teacher who rebelling against the abuses of his time, is bound sooner or later to pay for his protest with his life.

No doubt the next great solution of this problem is to be somewhere along this line. But is the solution reached when the analogy of Christ's life and work to that of other great martyrs is traced? We all believe in these days, I think it is safe to say, that Christ died to save man from man, not man from God—social redemption; that Christ died to save man from self, not man from Satan—individual redemption; that Christ died to save man from sin, not man from hell—immediate redemption; but is it safe to say that the age is to be content with the statement that he died, or, for that matter, lived, for these ends, only as Huss, Savonarola, Socrates, or Daniel lived and died for man's redemption?

No, there is something greater here, and more mysterious; greater as the degree of difference between him and them amounted to a difference in kind; more mysterious as the express revelation of God in him, the hatred of immaculate purity for sin, the suffering of untainted goodness in an atmosphere of taint and stain, all are more or less mysterious to the contaminated vision of sinful men.

The present attempt at a constructive statement upon the subject of the atonement—and it cannot be too often emphasized that it is only an attempt that has so far been made—must begin, it seems to me, somewhere near a point like the following, which has become so familiar in the scientific statements of the day:

All life and all progress in the world is at the expense of sacrifice and death on the part of some one or many. Mere physical existence can only be begun and maintained as the result of rapid, repeated, widespread death. Not only we, but all creatures rise on stepping-stones of others' dead selves to higher things. The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now, in giving birth to the next day and the next generation, and the next era. To put it ever on the lowest plane, it is not merely certain rudimentary forms of life that make their culminating act the act of reproduction, and with this climax of their careers pass off the stage of the living forever; but even the highest type of life—man—in giving life to his kind that are to follow him, in nurturing them, guarding them, rearing them, voluntarily embraces decay and death, if gradual, yet no less sure.

This sacrifice of life that other life may follow—higher, better life or else the universe is all out of gear—is partly involuntary and partly voluntary. The struggle for life has its fail in the struggle for the life of others. The pouring out of blood for the sustenance of the beasts that prey has its opposite motive in the pouring out of their hearts' rich tide by the mothers of the race that prays. The awful war of extermination that rages in the thick jungles of the tiniest grass-blades as well as in the greatest forests and mountain fastnesses claims not more victims than the altars of voluntary vicarious sacrifice upon which the parents of all men and many creatures willingly and gladly lay down their lives.

The same principle applies, does it not, in matters higher than mere physical existence. There is no advancement in human thought, no growth of any great telling movement among men except at the cost of life. Advance comes by friction, opposition, battle; and these waste life. The scholar burns out his life with his midnight oil. The preacher—if he be really a preacher—dies just so much upon the cross, every time he ascends his pulpit. The statesman—if he be one, and not a mere politician—gives his life for great ideas just as really through his toil as the soldier in his marches and his battles. The man of affairs, that deserts may be watered and conquered, roads built, the earth peopled and prospered, gives his life whatever the motive, either in midnight



journeys, or meetings, or wastes it in the confinement of a cell-like office. The world of thought grows, develops, but at what tremendous cost of human life!

In the same fashion, may it be, is it not true that in the world of spirit, growth comes only in the train of death? That souls may be uplifted, cleansed, exalted, redeemed, someone or many must die. Indeed we have seen many die in the ages past for just this purpose. A moral vicarious sacrifice needs little illustration beside our own memories of a long and heroic history. So far we can understand. But is it not possible that just at this point enters the larger sacrifice which we cannot understand—a mysterious sacrifice, a death demanded in the very nature of things spiritual, that higher life, eternal life, sin-free life might be the portion of the race? The necessity for such a sacrifice is no more mysterious, no more awful, than the necessity for the wholesale slaughter and the multitudinous self-immolation that is going on every hour in the world.

With this general hint, then, as to how the process of redemption is likely to appear to the modern mind, we may attempt to trace its course.

Here is the fact of sin in the world—the one universal problem that man had ever grappled with. Everywhere and in all times men had struggled with it. They had sacrificed lamb after lamb, bullock after bullock, hecatomb after hecatomb, till their temples had run red with blood, and yet, like Lady Macbeth, they had never been able to wash out the foul stain upon their hands. They had a consciousness of their God or their God's hatred of sin, and yet though they had erected priesthoods to intercede with him, they had never been able to arrive certainly at a sense of forgiveness which was, and perhaps still is, the end and aim of all religious service. For one thing, they were uncertain as to the character of their God, and his attitude toward rebellious children.

Such being the state of affairs, and God seeing it, felt the need of a solution for man, of this tragic question; and as a means to this end, of a full revelation to man of his own heart—its hatred toward and horror of sin, its love for and pity toward man. So, when the fulness of time had come, when man had reached

such maturity as would comprehend, in some measure, his self-revelation, the incarnation followed. God chose to reveal his qualities not in a book, not in the words of prophets and teachers, not in a system of theological statements, not in the works of nature. He had already shadowily revealed himself in all these ways; and to individual minds, here and there, these revelations had been intelligible. But to the great multitude of men there is but one book legible and comprehensible, and that is man. Everybody could read a man's life, everybody would read a man's life—so interesting, so fascinating is man to humanity. Hence, when God would send his final message to humanity he must write in this final and universal language of mankind—a man. He did so. He said to the world: "This man is myself. What he is I am. He does always the things that please me. He and I are one. He that hath seen him hath seen me."

Having thus revealed himself fully to men, he proceeded to show through this human medium, his attitude toward sin. Never in all the world has there been such rebuke of sin as in the mere presence of Jesus Christ upon the earth. Not the broken tables of the law, not the fiery serpents in the wilderness, not the deluge, nor the ashes of Gomorrah have ever carried the conviction of God's unalterable and inappeasable hostility to guilt as has the quiet, gentle, calm dignity of Jesus' sinlessness. The word of God is here heard most convincingly not in the earthquake, not in the fire and tempest, but in the still small voice of the incarnate God. His presence, like that of the Holy Spirit, nay which is identical with that of the Holy Spirit, convicts the world of sin and judgment.

And yet, along with this message of hatred toward sin comes the major strain, the dominant theme, in the symphony of Jesus' life, of God's overflowing, inextinguishable love for man—the sinner. Individuals heard the strain—Oh, so clearly—the rich young ruler, the woman of Samaria, Zaccheus, the publican, Simon Peter, the traitor, the poor drab in the Temple—these and scores besides heard the new note, the song of love and forgiveness: "Neither do I condemn thee, go and sin no more." Here was no consuming fire of wrath, here was no freezing ice of impenetrable sinlessness, lofty, stark, and aloof. Here was gentle-

ness, long-suffering, mercy, love. This was the heart of God. Individuals caught the message, the nation caught it, and slowly the nations catch it, too.

But this goodness, this tenderness, this sinlessness, this embodied mercy, must suffer in the presence of sinfulness. The very word long-suffering shows that we have felt some inkling of the pains of God. We have suffered, too, have we not, in some feeble attempts at a purely moral redemption. We have wrestled in soul with an erring brother in the bonds of his sin, with a wilful and headstrong child, with a criminal wretch struggling to be free of the shackles of long habit. We, now and then, have made vicarious atonement, at least in its elements, so far as the simple moral motive extends. But we are not God. We did not make man. We are not responsible for his well-being, his ongoing, in short his redemption. We, therefore, cannot understand the full agony of creative grief at the moral maladjustment of the creature.

We do not know, we cannot tell,  
The pain he had to bear.

If we suffer in the throes of a rebirth for some friend, parishioner, or relative, struggling loose from a wicked past, what must have been the agonies of Gethsemane, and of the hours upon the cross?

I would not be misunderstood as implying that this sympathetic moral passion is all there was to the atonement. It is about all that we can understand. But at the outset I tried to say that, in my judgment, mystery is a legitimate part of religion; and because we cannot understand more than this is no reason why we should affirm that there is no more. Indeed we cannot understand why there should be pain and passion in mere physical birth, in intellectual birth, in moral birth. Why then is it a thing incredible that we cannot analyze, systematize, theologize plainly, mathematically, dogmatically, this mysterious process of redemption?

The time has gone by, in my judgment, when theologians presume God to scan, when they employ with smug certitude the phrases, "scheme of redemption," "plan of salvation," and

the like. We have come to feel that the scheme, if there is one, is too stellar in its scope, the plan, if there is one, is too nearly like the Pleiades in proportions for us to outline with a geometrical exactness, in the size of a printed page.

That "God hath his mysteries of grace, ways that we cannot tell," I, for one, firmly believe. That he has thus dealt in the profundity of his wisdom, with the problem of sin, I have no doubt. That somehow the sufferings of Christ were necessary to accomplish his gigantic purpose is altogether in line with the best scientific thought of today. That those sufferings fulfilled something more than the purpose of erecting a beautiful moral ideal of self-forgetfulness, heroism, courage, renunciation, is, I believe, the conviction of this present age and of the best thought of the age just coming on. What that purpose was we can, no doubt, do little more than hint; but that hint, in harmony with the ascent of man, finds its analogue in the struggle for the life of others which is one of the leading themes in the natural science, social science, political science of the time.

Poets sometimes reach truer conclusions than philosophers, as hearts sometimes are more nearly infallible than heads; and it is a modern American, the editor of one of our leading magazines, who writes:

Subtlest thought shall fail and learning falter,  
Churches change, forms perish, systems go;  
But our deep human needs they will not alter,  
Christ no after age shall ere outgrow.  
Yea, amen, O changeless one, thou only  
Art life's guide and spiritual goal,  
Thou the light across the dark vale lonely,  
Thou the eternal haven of the soul.

I do not feel that I have done much more than preach about this theme—and a little preachment, at that. I fear that the academic philosophers who are here will think it woefully inadequate as a theological statement. And yet, if I have done anything at all, in my half-hour, it is to give the impression that I consider this much more of a theme for preaching than for philosophizing; for, when you philosophers shall fail in stating it, we preachers shall succeed in singing it, such an easy and such a

winged song it is, so mysteriously beautiful and so beautifully mysterious, into its resting-place in the aching, sin-scarred hearts of men. I cannot state it in scientific fashion, nor do I believe that you can, but I can preach it, after a certain fashion, and by God's grace I intend to go on preaching it, till this poor lisping stammering tongue lies silent in the grave; and then I expect to hear it both stated and preached in triumphant voices on the plains of God.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: The second paper on this theme is by Rev. Frederick Lent, New Haven, Conn. Mr. Lent will take the platform.

REV. FREDERICK LENT, PH.D. (Baptist), of New Haven, Conn., presented the following paper:

#### THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT IN TERMS OF MODERN THOUGHT

There is only one thing fundamental in a man's theology, and that is his thought of God. This determines his view of atonement, and every other article of his creed. Anselm's notion of God, which corresponded to the feudal ideas of the age, demanded a sufficient reparation for the insult done the honor of God. With the transition from feudalism to modern forms of government, came the thought of God who must maintain the sanctity of his moral government. The theory of penal satisfaction is based on the conception of a God who must punish sin. The theories of Anselm, Grotius, and the Protestant reformers are passing away, because their conceptions of God are outgrown. We are not better logicians than they, but we start from different premises. We are revolted by the lines of Watts (quoted by Canon Farrar in *The Atonement in Modern Religious Thought*, London, 1900, p. 37):

Rich were the drops of Jesus' blood  
That calmed God's frowning face,  
That sprinkled o'er the burning throne  
And turned the wrath to grace.

Foreign to our thinking are Spurgeon's words: "Christ took the cup in both hands, and at one tremendous draught of love

drank damnation dry." We believe in God the Father as he is revealed in the teaching, life, and character of Jesus. It is this conception of God as Father which shapes the modern view of atonement. The thought of Christ being punished in our stead or dying to satisfy the claims of justice is out of harmony with Jesus' teaching concerning God. The God of Jesus is forgiving, generous, and good even to the wicked and ungrateful. Mercy is his primary attribute. The whole gospel is given in the parable of the Prodigal Son. It says nothing concerning eternal decrees, it has no word about God's offended honor, or violated law and its satisfaction. The parable does not deal with things, but with personal relations between Father and Son. It sets forth the Father's pitying, longing love, which awaits the sinful child's return in repentance. It shows how God forgives freely, restoring the penitent to favor and fellowship. Jesus taught that we must be merciful because God is. "Then came Peter and said to him, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? Until seven times? Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, until seven times but until seventy times seven" (Matt. 18: 21-23). Why? Because this is the law of the kingdom of heaven; that is, it is God's way. St. Paul had the same conception of God when he said "Be ye kind to one another, tender-hearted, forgiving each other, as God in Christ forgave you. . . . Be ye therefore imitators of God, as beloved children" (Eph. 4:32-5:1). We must forgive freely, without exacting penalty for injuries, because God thus forgives. In Jesus' teaching, the only condition of forgiveness is repentance. "It is inconceivable that God should forgive the impenitent, and equally inconceivable that he should not forgive the penitent. The object of all of God's dealings is to win us to himself. The penitent sinner is eagerly welcomed. However seriously one injures you, however just and keen your resentment, you cannot cherish anger when he comes crushed, groveling at your feet, and doing all he can to compensate.

Who is not with repentance satisfied,  
Is not of heaven or earth.

To cherish resentment and withhold forgiveness in such a case is fatuous and devilish. True penitence is, in short, irresistible.

It is the real solvent of past discord" (Marcus Dods, *The Atonement in Modern Religious Thought*, p. 182).

Jesus' attitude toward sinners shows how God deals with them. He simply said to the penitent, "Thy sins are forgiven." The sinful and stained found in him a ready friend. It would never occur to one that Jesus required to be propitiated before he could pardon. But Jesus was the revelation of God, and what is true of him is true of God. The old soldier of Plymouth made the mistake of sending to woo Priscilla for him one whom she could love as she could not love the grim warrior who sent him. Did God make the mistake of sending Jesus, loving, tender, forgiving, merciful, so that men find in Christ what is not in the Father? Nay, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," he said. He came with God's own passion for men, to seek the lost, and call sinners to repentance. So by his life and character he showed that God is satisfied, not with the punishment of sin, but with the recovery of the sinner. Salvation must be more than mere remission of the penalty of sin. It must be the moral union of the repentant sinner with God. The work of Jesus looks toward a genuine atonement, at-one-ment.

Jesus as the revealer of God the Father is the final authority for our thought of atonement. We cannot go to the Bible as a unit of which any text has equal value with every other text. The Bible is a record of religious progress. It contains the history of the doctrine of atonement in its development from the pagan to the Christian point of view. We cannot expect, nor do we find, one view only, consistently set forth from first to last. Modern historical study of biblical theology finds in the Bible different conceptions of the nature of sin, of sacrifice, and of the ground of forgiveness. It traces the different teachings to their sources in the various periods of time, and finds widely variant views current in the same period. It does find, however, that in the Old Testament vicarious satisfaction or penal substitution is not a characteristic teaching, but rather, incidental and subordinate. Even in the Levitical code, sacrifice is efficacious only as it expresses the heart and mind of the worshiper. The prophetic teaching is that of Jesus, free pardon for sin conditioned on repentance. It is not unfair to say that Ps. 51 contains the

most characteristic teaching of the Old Testament concerning sin, sacrifice, and forgiveness.

The New Testament writers are for the most part in their interpretation of Christ's work in accord with his own thought. Yet, if the outlook on our problem be from the narrow opening of some single texts, we may arrive at conclusions wholly at variance with the teaching of Jesus and the general trend of New Testament thought. Our doctrine of atonement must not be formulated by a mere systematization of proof texts, but by reference to Christ as the ultimate and final authority, in teaching, life, and character.

But did Jesus give an adequate and complete teaching concerning the forgiveness of sins and the meaning of salvation? It would be strange if he did not, when his mission was the redemption of men. To whom shall we go for the words of eternal life if not to Jesus? The parable of the prodigal son contains all that Jesus regarded as essential in setting forth the Father's forgiveness and acceptance of the repentant Son. Is it not true that our theology must be a return to the gospel of Jesus? We are not to find elsewhere supplementary corrective teaching. Jesus gave a whole gospel. His work was to reveal the Father, and this he accomplished, in what he said, and was, and did.

It is not certain that Jesus regarded his death as a necessary part of his career from the very beginning of his ministry. As a result of the hostility which gathered head against him, his pondering on the Scriptures and his deep insight into the heart of the Father, his unique religious consciousness led him to the conviction that death was the inevitable end of his way. He had come to devote his life absolutely without stint to the service of men, even to death, if need be, to set them free from the bondage of sin. As time went on, he saw that to be true to his mission he must die. But there is no hint that he ever thought of his suffering and death as the vicarious endurance of penalty. It was vicarious suffering indeed, but he did not base the forgiveness of sins upon it. He regarded his death as the culmination of a career, such that it would secure the end he sought, the exemplification of that relation to God and men which God approves. His death as revealing the will of God, and the ideal of life,



becomes redemptive for those who accept the truth thus revealed, (Compare Burton, "Biblical Doctrine of Atonement," *Biblical World*, June, July, 1908.)

If we ask how men obtained forgiveness of sin before Jesus died, we find that the prophets and Psalmist describe an experience in no way different from the religious experience of today. They came directly to God, and found mercy, being penitent. Isaiah, Micah, Amos, all write in the strongest condemnation of the idea that sacrifice is needed to placate God. God asks repentance, and only repentance. Ezekiel is equally emphatic in declaring that remission of sins follows repentance. The Psalmist stained with bloodguiltiness found pardon, according unto the multitude of God's tender mercies, because he acknowledged his transgressions. He offered no sacrifice but that of a broken and contrite spirit, because God is pleased with no other. In other words, the death of Christ made no change in God. The Psalmist knew that God is "good, ready to forgive, and abundant in loving kindness to all who call upon him." Jesus suffered, not to purchase the pardon of God for men, but to reveal that which was eternally in the heart of God. If, before Jesus, men could trust God's merciful love, how much more may we, who look back upon the cross! Surely, if Christ's death had been necessary to the pardon of sins, he would have come earlier in the history of the world. It is out of the question to suppose that prior to his death God exercised forgiveness in anticipation of Calvary's payment of the human debt of sin. There is no hint of it in Scripture. If he did, then the prophets and the Psalmist trusted a mercy which did not exist, and God was other than he seemed to them, who believed in the forgiveness of sins solely because of his loving kindness. But we cannot entertain such a thought. Rather, we see in the cross of Christ the full light of revelation of God's eternal love, which sent its foregleams through all the ages, until in the fulness of time, God sent forth his son. Viewed as a sacrifice to appease God, the cross came woefully late. Seen as a revelation of eternal atonement, it stand fittingly related to all the past and coming ages.

The full disclosure of God the Father could be made only through the cross, and in this, as well as in the historical circum-

stances, lies the necessity for the death of Jesus. He must die if he would save men. The cross is the only adequate expression of that which is fundamental in God, his suffering love in his relation to men. Jesus came preaching the "kingdom of heaven." How often the phrase was on his lips! But does he ever call God "king?" Not once. Is God, as Jesus taught of him, less mighty, less kingly? No, but the king is Father. The Kingdom of God, and the kingship of God are expressed in terms of fatherhood. The parable of the Prodigal Son shows the king as first of all Father. The joy at the return of the lost indicates the sorrow that love felt while he was away. Jesus' reply to Zebedee's son's request for royal office shows what he regarded as primary in the kingdom of heaven, that is, in God himself. "Ye know that they who are accounted to rule over the gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them. But it shall not be so among you. But whosoever would become great among you, shall be your minister and whosoever would be first among you shall be servant of all. For the Son of man also came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Mark 10: 42-45). The principle of service, of devotion even to death, is the law of God's nature. "Except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it brings forth fruit." This Jesus saw as the law at the center of God's universe, of God's being. It is a law of the moral world as truly as gravitation is a law of the physical. Bushnell was interpreting Jesus when he grounded vicarious sacrifice in principles of universal obligations. So if Jesus revealed the Father in his essential nature, he must go to the cross, a voluntary sacrifice for the sins of men. Anything less would have left the revelation, not merely partial, but totally inadequate, since that which is most characteristic of the king, his suffering love, could not have been disclosed. The cross revealed to what lengths love can go in seeking the redemption of men. It was not a brief transaction, a spectacle of suffering whose purpose was to appease an angry God. It was rather God's self-disclosure, showing that the cross was in his heart eternally, long before it stood on Calvary.

Thus the cross reveals that which is at the center of God's

universe. It shows God eternally seeking to win men to fellowship and moral oneness with him; sparing no cost to accomplish this. It reveals the upward way of God with man, and the sacrifice back of the moral progress of the race. God's world is not blasted, but growing. The "Fall" is not the explanation of the incarnation. The work of Christ is not an interpolation, but the crowning act in the revelation of God's eternal process of human redemption, in labor, passion, and sacrifice. The incarnation must have taken place, if there had been no sin, because of God's eternal purpose to perfect man into union with himself. Given the fact of sin, then God's attitude toward men must result in the death of the incarnate one, to give full expression to God.

The cross revealed the perfect experience of sonship in a human life, and was the manifestation of God's purpose. The cross has cosmic significance. It shows the unwearying self-sacrifice of God in his work for the final perfecting of all things. When John was on Patmos, he saw the throne of the Almighty God the King. The sovereign purpose and work of God was to be revealed. Only the lion of the tribe of Judah was able to unloose the seals of the book, and make known God's kingly acts. John looked to see the lion, but saw, standing in the midst of the throne, a lamb, as it had been slain (Rev., chap. 5). The symbolism is plain. The throne means sovereignty, the slain lamb, suffering love; it is "in the midst of the throne," that is, eternally at the heart of God's being and power; it "is in the midst of the throne and of the four living creatures, and of the elders;" that is, the cross is the visible center of God's universe, the secret at the very core of all things. Only the cross could fully reveal God.

Because the cross reveals the self-sacrificing love of God, it makes plain his righteousness, and exhibits his estimate of the sin of men. Here it is seen that God grudges no sacrifice by which righteousness can be promoted and how low love will stoop to rescue us from the thralldom of sin. Righteousness is seen to be his supreme interest. He is not indifferent to sin. The only adequate repentance for sin must be made in the light of the cross, which alone shows the infinite sorrow of God, and the

pangs he suffers until it be exterminated, and we are wholly cleansed from it.

After a study of atonement in the great literatures of all times and lands, Dinsmore finds that the conviction of the world is this:

If there is a disposition on the part of the injured one to forgive, and genuine repentance in the heart of the wrongdoer, there is no obstacle to complete pardon, provided the mercy is so granted and accepted that the true nature of the wrong is understood by both parties and the sanctities of moral obligation receive no weakening.<sup>1</sup>

It has been said that Christ must die bearing our punishment for sin, that God's righteousness might be demonstrated, by showing that he is not indifferent to sin. But could God not show his hatred of sin, and make us feel his righteousness, except by the infliction of penalty? How does a child know his mother's estimate of his sin? By the punishment she inflicts upon him, or on an innocent person who suffers in his stead? Does he not see the heinousness of his wrong because of the suffering it causes her? If anything will beget repentance in his heart, it is not infliction of the punishment he knows is due, but an appreciation of the anguish she endures. God's hatred of sin could not be adequately expressed except by his own suffering. Only infinite love could reveal the righteousness of God, and the unspeakable awfulness of sin. One cannot stand at the cross and think lightly of sin. The acceptance of free pardon there cannot weaken, but must rather strengthen the sanctities of moral obligation. For such forgiveness at the cross can come only by the repudiation of sin which is condemned in the cross. Such repentance is the return to moral oneness with God. It is faith which God reckons as righteousness, because it is incipient righteousness, the attitude of obedience and love. It is union with Christ, and being thus reconciled to God by the death of his son, we are saved through his life. Well said Alexander MacLaren: "A Christianity without a dying Christ is a dying Christianity." "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ."

<sup>1</sup> Dinsmore, *Atonement in Literature and Life*, p. 164.

The conception of God as Father determines also the modern view of sin, its nature, its penalty, and the atonement it requires. John said, "Sin is lawlessness." It is either a single act expressive of a sinful disposition, or it is the sinful character itself. It is not infraction of statute law. It is rather the opposite of love, a state of character unlike the divine character. It is alienation from the Father. It is not merely something negative, the absence of goodness. It is self-affirmation; it is a fixed moral preference; it is banishment from the Father's love and fellowship. The penalty of sin is therefore in itself. It is guilt, which results in moral deterioration, and if persisted in, in eternal separation from God. Our idea of God forbids us to think that he can have any other end in punishment than the discipline and recovery of the sinner. God's law of action with men is not "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth." We cannot admit that he requires so much punishment for so much sin. And on the other hand, the nature of sin's penalty is such that it is impossible to transfer it. No one can become guilty in my stead. There is no place for penal substitution in the moral constitution of things. Penalty can be removed only by the removal of sin itself. Atonement cannot be the suffering of penalty viewed as inflicted by God for the vindication of law. If sin were merely a debt, or insult to a sovereign, then we might think of reparation. Crime against statutory law can be visited with statutory punishment. But since sin is character, and its penalty is in terms of character, Christ cannot take our place in bearing our punishment. Redemption must be, not remission of penalty, but emancipation from the thralldom of sin itself. This is the work which Jesus does in the career by which he revealed God, by life, teaching, character, and the crowning act, the death on the cross, issuing in the resurrection and ascended life. Jesus could not take upon him our sin, as character, but he could enter into our wretched condition, by strong sympathy, and die, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God. A careful study of the New Testament will show that Jesus and all the writers regard his death, not as the bearing of penalty, but as suffered for the sake of cleansing us from sin and reconciling us to God.

Be the expiatory expressions of Paul and Hebrews what they may,

they are from the thought world of late Judaism, but the exposition by both writers, of the actual realization of salvation is a transcript of moral experience, and is presented in terms expressive of moral participation in the inner life of Jesus, the reproduction in the believer of the representative humanity of Christ.<sup>2</sup>

If sin is character, then salvation must be in terms of character. God must be satisfied in the death of Christ, not because it is the vindication of broken law, but because it is the crowning act in that work which recovers the sinful from sin, and brings the prodigal back to fellowship with the Father. "Unto him that loveth us, and loosed us from our sins by his blood; and he made us to be a kingdom, to be priests unto his God and Father; to him be the glory and dominion for ever and ever. *Amen.*"

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We will now listen to the appointed speakers in the discussion of the theme of this afternoon. Professor Leroy Waterman, of Hillsdale, Mich., will please step forward.

PROFESSOR LEROY WATERMAN, PH.D (Free Baptist), Hillsdale, Mich., addressed the Congress as follows:

*Mr. President:* There are two general ways of apprehending this subject according as we regard it from the *de facto* or the *de jure* standpoint, as a static or a kinetic. We may call the one formally constructive, the other inductively reconstructive.

Under the former we should confine ourselves to a collation of statements of the doctrine of atonement that belong exclusively to modern times; according to the latter we should endeavor to state the essentials for a formulated doctrine of atonement basing them upon what is assured as valid for us in modern thought-development. I take it for granted that the practical interest which brings this body together assures the latter as the intent of the theme.

This practical interest is in fact dominant in our subject, for admittedly there is no statement of the atonement in terms of modern thought that is generally recognized among the Protestant churches. And yet here is a teaching respecting which we may venture to assert that it has never ceased to form the key-

<sup>2</sup> Stevens, *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, p. 374.

stone in the arch of Christian doctrine, but everyone is aware that the force and intelligibility of any doctrine, to the average individual, depends upon its being clearly stated in the language of the day. It would seem therefore that as Protestants we have kept this important doctrine in the language of the Middle Ages much as the Catholics have kept their ritual in the language of antiquity, but with far less reason or consistency on our part. That is, this is so unless there is something in the infallibility of the Middle Ages which forbids any change. But while the generally accepted statements of the doctrine hail from the Middle Ages, yet it could scarcely be said that Protestantism has ever agreed on any generally recognized formula of the atonement. There seems to be no reason therefore from that quarter to think that we have had any final statement of the doctrine.

The only other authority that could make our task obsolete is the Bible itself. So far as the word is concerned, in the New Testament we no longer in the Revised Version have to deal with "atonement" but have in its stead the less formidable word "reconciliation," and that only in the Pauline epistles. Other writers speak of propitiation. Christ himself uses neither one. The New Testament contains no authorized or fixed statement of atonement. The several writers vary among themselves both as to terminology and view-point. We are thus biblically directed either to discriminate between the New Testament writers, a choice hard indeed to justify, or to formulate our own statement, if we would have one; at the same time it is a factor in our undertaking not to be overlooked that before the Middle Ages the church had already devised a form of the doctrine which we could not possibly accept, viz., that Christ's death was a price paid to the Evil One. We are thus true to the Bible, to history, and to our own need when we attempt a restatement of the atonement in terms of modern thought.

But, of course, if we are expected to formulate something here upon which we ourselves and our several constituencies shall speedily agree, as in the ancient councils of the church, someone must be delegated with unlimited powers for the excommunication of the heretics. Fortunately, however, such unanimity is not necessary for the justification of this discussion, for, having

gotten about as far apart as possible in days that are past on many matters, the chances are now all in our favor that every reasonable and intelligent effort we make will somehow bring us a little nearer together.

To formulate the elements for a modern statement of atonement bids us make two inquiries: first, What is the essential meaning in the idea of atonement? and secondly, What is it that distinguishes the thought of this age from that of all other periods?

With respect to the first question the term atonement etymologically signifies at-one-ment, i. e., the act or the result of the act that brings about agreement and harmony between parties previously at variance. Historically, the word has been applied as an equivalent to כִּבֵּר, καταλλαγή, ἱλασμός, *satisfactio*, and *substitutio*. Now it is impossible to equate such words as *satisfactio* and καταλλαγή, or כִּבֵּר and *substitutio*. Indeed these words contain mutually contradictory elements, but on the other hand, all these terms, in the result each is supposed to accomplish, do find agreement in the word atonement, i. e., at-one-ment, so that we may say that the historical range of the word confirms the etymological significance as its true meaning. But this meaning gives no prestige to any statement of the doctrine that has ever been made. It is equally indifferent and unchanged whether the resistance to be overcome in the act of atonement was due to God's unwillingness or his inability, or whether it came entirely from man's perversity and sinfulness or perchance were there hindrances in the way on both sides. The doctrine merely asserts that the great obstacle in the way of the at-one-ment of God and man, whatever it was, was overcome through Jesus Christ.

And what would be lost if no one insisted upon anything further than this? Christ is given a unique and necessary place in the process of redemption. The sinner may thereby be reconciled to God and to a godly life. Historically this is exactly what has taken place. But what has the church gained by insisting upon going beyond this as a condition of communion? Chiefly numerical increase of sects, the weakness of a divided house, a shameful spectacle before the world, and a confusion in men's minds as to there being any vital or necessary truth in



the doctrine. This, however, in no sense deters us from seeking a statement of the doctrine in terms of modern thought, but in some respects makes it imperative.

We come thus to our second query, What is it that distinguishes the thought of today from that of other periods? There are those who will point out that there is much of shallowness and perversity in present-day thought. But, if true, that cannot be claimed as a peculiarity of this age. There has been too much of that kind of thinking in every age.

The age has been characterized by many as materialistic, and no one would deny that this has been strongly emphasized in modern thought, but at the same time idealism has never been more strongly emphasized than in this age. Some might characterize modern thinking by its antinomies, but these are always prominent in periods of great thought advancement.

But, I think, we might agree that modern thought has been characterized by the purposeful endeavor to see things as nearly as possible as they really are, regardless of personal interest or authority, and that this has been true of this age to an extent known by no other. In the range of thought this has vastly extended the realm and the significance of law. With reference to the past it has developed the historical sense and the historical method. In the realm of personal relations it has clarified and enlarged the ethical sphere including both human and divine relations. So that with respect to God it has declared God wholly ethical; so ethical that he could not do wrong even to be just; so ethical that it declares any attempt on God's part to pay himself a debt makes *satisfactio* a mere brazen symbol; so ethical that propitiation is a word no longer applicable to God, for if one desired of God what was truly ethical God himself is so ethical that it, by very virtue of that fact, is bound to be one of God's strong desires and so propitiation could have no place. It is absurd to propitiate God to do what he already strongly wishes to do. But if we desired of God what was not truly ethical, no propitiation that could be conceived could ever accomplish its object with God.

If God is angry with us it must be for something morally indefensible on our part, and nothing can ever restore his favor

but the resolute putting away of such conduct. But when it has been so put away, God is ethical enough so that the cause of his displeasure being removed his anger also must cease, and nothing else could ever make it cease; no attempted substitution by a blameless person of conduct due from another can even make God feel differently toward the one from whom it is still due.

God is so ethical and has the highest ethical welfare of the universe so at heart that it is impossible adequately to express his relations to his creatures by any transaction of the market or forensic formula of the courts. But having formed the universe with the ethical as its highest object, having planned it with that end in view, and having worked consistently for that end through all the ages wherever a creature steps out wholeheartedly with that end in view, God is with him by virtue of his very nature and without any previous canceling of debts or balancing of merit.

The obstacles to at-one-ment between God and man are therefore not at all to be found in God; they are consequently wholly in man. They were great enough to take the life of the innocent Son of God, great enough to make the missionary of his message a cross-bearer in every age, great enough to take nineteen hundred years for his professed followers to begin to see dimly what it might mean to have a truly Christian state.

The atonement therefore, in terms of modern thought as the work wrought by Christ, was not an effect wrought on God, but the overcoming of the obstacles to the conciliation of God and man, which obstacles were wholly in man.

In mechanical terms, the work of Christ was the overcoming of the inertia of human personalities which arose from his seeking to give them a new and unwonted motive and direction. In terms of elemental affinity, Christ's work is the energy of the crucible which is able to free the radium of the human spirit from the uranium residues wherein it is lost and so render its purified energy available for the service of God and of mankind. In terms of living organism, the atoning death of Christ stands as the violent reaction due to the infusion of his healing life into the diseased organism of humanity, whereby health once more becomes possible. In terms of personality, the atoning death of

Christ is the eager and complete self-sacrifice of that other Elder Brother who freely gave the last breath of his matchless life to seek out and recover that other Prodigal who was in so far unable to come to himself and arise, in that he no longer knew that he had a Father of unlimited resources who loved only his highest welfare. The passion of Christ's life was not to make God ready, or to empower him, to forgive men's sins; but to make men ready to be forgiven of a Father. For God so loved the world.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We have but one more appointed speaker and after that there will be discussion by volunteers. It will be necessary for you to send your card to the Secretary before the other speaker ends. We will now listen to Professor Allan Hoben, of Chicago.

PROFESSOR ALLAN HOBEN, PH.D., (Baptist), Chicago, Ill., addressed the Congress as follows:

*Mr. President, and Friends:* It is a matter worthy of note that in the discussion of this general topic, "The Doctrine of Atonement in Terms of Modern Thought," practically everything that has been said should relate to Jesus Christ. It is a tribute which we all unconsciously pay, I think, to the position which he has taken for himself as Lord and Savior. The subject, however, as stated in the programme, is a thoroughly general one, a consideration of the universal fact of atonement; which fact is of course most evident in the experience of Jesus.

I suppose that these theological terms of ours and attempts at statements are the outgrowth always of practical necessity; they may not always be notable for their philosophical consistency, but they are always related to some practical issue. Atonement, therefore, has been variously set forth, both in ethnic religions, in Old Testament religion, and in the religion of the New Testament. It is a naïve supposition of ours that there ever was any agreement, either in scriptural times or at any time since atonement began to engage man's thought, and probably the supposition that we could now reach agreement is equally naïve. The process which is going on in our minds today is the old effort which man's mind makes when confronted with a vast truth. No

one statement, as has been suggested this afternoon, is adequate; no single definition can cover all the items in atonement.

We feel the charm of the ocean; we sit beside it in wonder; we perhaps ride across its billows, but when we take a cupful of water from it to our home and attempt to say, "This is the ocean," then our definition fails.

Now, to turn to the items, the counts of various elements of modern thought in which we would hope to describe in part at least this great fact of atonement, there are some things which may be noticed. The first general feature is the growth of *orderliness*, a scientific method, the progress from cause to effect; the substitution of a process which is demonstrable in human thought for any mystical statement which gets its strength from symbolism and type. Modern thought is characterized by an endeavor to make truth demonstrable by orderly process.

A second item under this general head in modern thought is, I suppose, *the historical method*. We find the thought of atonement in the Old Testament, and we find side by side with its priestly exhibition a party who took very little pleasure in the priestly interpretation of the idea of atonement.

Christianity today, if I understand the historical connections, relates itself more definitely to this prophetic element than to the priestly. We find that the priestly party, in their idea of atonement, give large place to ceremonial significance, and that the operation of this idea is most clearly applied to the restoration of one to ceremonial standing before God. On the other hand, the prophetic party cries out that "the sacrifices of God are a broken and a contrite spirit."

The two elements have come over, I suppose, into the New Testament, Jesus being more closely allied to the prophetic spirit, and perhaps some of those who were subsequent to him dabbling unfortunately in the priestly mechanical thought. But we may venture to say that the ceremonial element which was allied with atonement in the Old Testament would have been forgotten by this time had it not been for its transposition into Christianity and the interpretation which Christianity made of the life of Jesus in terms of that ancient ceremonial. For the followers of Jesus beheld him upon the cross, and while Christ's own inter-

pretation of suffering was different from that of current Judaism and not regarded as penalty inflicted by God, the temptation was almost irresistible for the early Christians to take the spectacle which confronted the Christian mind in that first century and to make it, by the finest piece of strategy that was conceivable, a glorious interpretation in terms of the ancient ritual. Paul did this and so significant was his interpretation that the church to the present day cannot shake itself free from his very terminology. By that act of Christian strategy he was able to overcome the stumbling-block of the cross, to make it the central figure, and to gather about it truths which are imperishable. He indeed so revels in the thought that he rises to higher and more vital conceptions than those contained in ancient sacrifice.

According to the historical method, then, the approach to the atonement is not from the eternal counsels of God, is not theological, but it is an approach based upon our knowledge, however limited or extended, of certain transactions here upon the earth; and modern thought begins, not with any proposition as to what God would likely do or should have done, but with a certain study of what is known to have transpired.

One other count in modern thought is *psychology*, and if there shall be any modern statement of the atonement, it must have reference to psychology which is coming in more and more. Psychology is about to have its day. Now, there was in that old ceremonial the idea of deliverance. There was in the Old Testament, and, I think, in places in the New Testament, the idea of substitution. In the Old Testament time there were goats of the day of Atonement; one was slain and the other had the sins of the people laid upon him. After they had been thus expiated he carried them away into the desert. Psychology drops a suggestion here which is true for a certain stage of culture. The power of suggestion in that spectacle meant much for the attainment of the moral state desired. We are saying today that to be convinced of a thing, to enter into it as a fact, is three-quarters of its accomplishment. The thought is allied to exorcism which works today not so much with adults as with children and people of a low stage of culture. When the parent denounces the imaginary naughty child and drives it from the house with considerable

flourish, the better self of the real child returns and reigns in smiling triumph. Suggestion, the sense of otherness, transmission and so renunciation of the naughtiness—that is the process which, I doubt not, many of us have found effective. It is an ingredient but not an ultimate in the thought of atonement. So that the psychological import of one being free from his state of sinfulness is at a certain stage of human development a valuable thing, but Paul breaks through and above this into a higher territory of unexploited power. Whatever you have to say about Paul's doctrine of atonement, he is always in a realm that is fraught with power; it is always vital.

Another term in modern thought is *biology*. Now, biology may qualify the antithesis out of which Paul and those who followed him got some of their strongest arguments in the matter of atonement, for biology perhaps does not credit the Hebrew account of a fall; but is looking at a process which is more determinable and more capable of being traced than the accounts in the early chapters of Genesis. That will affect the statement. Further, biology tells us, as has been stated this afternoon, of the great vicarious principle to which the atonement in modern statement will certainly be related. It tells us of suffering; it does not venture to tell us anything as to equivalents in suffering, but it tells us the great fact that parenthood in the physical realm, parenthood in the mental realm, parenthood in the production of character—that is in the ethical realm—all of this is a vicarious process. Thus biology is related to the New Testament term, travail, the *sine qua non* of advance, the cost of aggressive goodness in the progress of God's cause upon this imperfect earth.

Another point of view in modern thought is that of *sociology* which will reinterpret the old solidarity argument; will, by a study of man as effecting and affected by association, give to us new values for such great words as those which enter into the study of atonement: faith, showing its social source, showing that we have no faith of our own, but we have a faith which is partly our labor and largely the product of a community life. It will reinterpret sin which in the old terms was the wrong-doing of this malefactor who was antisocial, who was against the best things, and who himself broke the laws of God. It will interpret sin in

terms of social surroundings and in terms of common obligation that bind together the supposedly righteous in society to that part of society that has gone wrong. It will interpret salvation in new terms. Salvation will become, not plucking brands from the burning, but giving some attention to the conflagration itself.

It will tell us of a glorious process in which we must have fellowship with Jesus rather than of eschatology. We will look back still with a thrill of devout admiration to the enthusiasm which possessed the first Christians and then we will bend down in labor to bring in that which they thought would come upon the clouds and suddenly from heaven. Atonement will say in terms of sociology, "What leaven do you put into the mass, the mass out of which alone any given life can make its growth? What do you put into it? The atonement must have its social interpretation."

Down in South Chicago a few years ago a devout minister began his labor in that treeless and smoky section of our great city; and with him, his wife, who gave herself to the work without counting the cost. After a few years of visitation and faithful labor among those people, mostly foreigners, she was worn out and died. Then the minister lost his reason. Well, they were paying a ransom. Did they pay it to Satan? Modern thought is not so sure about Satan. They paid it to the Moloch of modern commerce. They paid it to the principle which every child of God has to meet today in society, that mammon is greater than manhood, and there you get the touch of sociology, upon the eternal fact of atonement. Oh, brethren, if Paul should burst upon our times with all of his former passion for Jesus and for man's redemption, do you suppose that his attempt to describe that matchless love would be without reference to these modern economic facts?

But the hardest thing of all in the modern count, the thing that will be most difficult in restatement, is the ethical, the strictly ethical content. As has been said this afternoon, and in a way which I could not even hope to approach, God practices no deception; never puts any colored glasses on his eyes, so he can look at people and say they are not what they are but they are what they seem to be. There is no magic that could possibly be exer-

cised by anyone, much less by him whom we honor as the Son of God, to make the slightest deviation in the thought of God to see things as they really are. That has been emphasized and ethics will take account of that. The father, when the prodigal son came home, did not have to find anyone to beat. There has grown up in Protestantism because of a mean idea of substitution that has nothing of the laying down of one's own life, which the apostle Paul had taught—if indeed he spoke of substitution—a habit of thought which promotes within the Protestant church and the evangelical wing of the Protestant church a shifting of responsibility; a pauperism of manliness; a sloppy morality; a hiding behind someone else who you hope will be hit instead of you.

Our churches have more weak brothers who cause ministers trouble and who cause business men great anxiety in their dealings with them, standing behind the proposition that it is not morality and not the quality of character that constitute salvation, but "a Jesus who stands there to be smitten in my stead." Brethren, modern ethics says it is not moral; that is what it says. You cannot transfer morality. Why, you cannot transfer education, friends, much less morality! I cannot take a young man out to the University of Chicago and put a gown on him and say he is clothed in the robe of education, meaning by that that he has thus been educated. That is all form and ceremony; that is not education. We cannot take a man and say, "You are unreliable; you are mean; you say unkind things to your wife; you cheat in business; but I am going to put the cloak of righteousness on you." It must be an achievement for him. By all that morality can ever be he must achieve it; he has got to win it. Now, in his winning of that I know no one whom I would set before him but Jesus Christ. There is the play of his inspiration, the influence, the invitation—ah, yes, the transformation of the personality by Jesus, but all in accord with the man's willing response, his effort, his quest. There is no mechanical transfer; substitution in this formal view of it is a snare and a delusion.

Jesus sought to unite all men to God as he himself was. Jesus was the unparalleled leader in that which should characterize every Christian. That is his own point of view. Jesus was in



the  $n$ -th power that which every true Christian must be in some power.

Another count in modern thought is *practical efficiency*, pragmatism. Does it work, and how much does it work? That is all. "By their fruits ye shall know them," and our reinterpretation must needs spring from our experience in saving effort born of the love of Christ and humanity.

Atonement then, I do not say the atonement of Jesus, I cannot compass that, I say atonement, this principle which is illustrated in the  $n$ -th power in Jesus Christ, is service for mankind undertaken as obedience to God in the spirit of love and faith, involving suffering because of the imperfect condition of humanity, and aiming to bring every member of society into such union with God and his fellows as will eventuate in a like service until the kingdom of God is fully come.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: I am very happy in having five cards here from five gentlemen who desire to speak, and I am sure you will be very glad to hear the first one, Professor Foster, of the University of Chicago.

PROFESSOR G. B. FOSTER, D.D., The University of Chicago:

I came here with my mind quite made up simply to listen to discussions and such interesting matters. But I have been pretty strongly urged to take some small part in your discussion, much as it seems to me that the illuminating and really edifying addresses to which we have listened are pretty nearly all, perhaps, that we can say upon the subject in the present state of reflection; unless indeed it be a single point at which in a moment or two I might possibly find myself able to arrive. The point which I shall mention, not because I think it is the most important, but almost because I fear if I do not speak of it it won't be spoken of at all (laughter), is: the atonement in terms of modern thought. Which atonement? Rather, it is the doctrine of the atonement in terms of modern thought. Which doctrine? There are a dozen, I suppose, with all those compromises between them and insensible gradations of one into another, so that we have left a roving commission here to pick out which one we want to state in terms of modern thought.

In the second place, which modern thought? Is it the radical dualism of the Ritchlians? Is it some form of modern monism? I am at a loss to tell. Then again, when I am to express it in terms of modern thought, is it simply that I am to take one of these doctrines of the atonement in its self-identical content and talk about it with modern words? Is that all? Is it then a doctrine of atonement which is for substance fixed and final, only to translate that content into the jargon of modern thought? Is that all? If it is, the whole business does not amount to much.

Again, is it the doctrine of the atonement at all, or is it the fact of atonement, that we are interested in? I take it that the reality is not doctrine but fact, the fact of the atonement. Very well, then, if it be fact, what is the condition of knowing what the fact is? It is not biblical criticism primarily. It is not a philological inquiry and I suspect that even archaeology can lend little assistance in understanding if it is the fact of the atonement that we wish to understand.

Brethren, here, as well as everywhere else, action precedes knowledge. Here as everywhere else, if we are to understand the atonement theoretically we must first *be* it practically. But we are living precisely in a time when pain hurts us; we do not like suffering. We wish to be insulated from it, and aside from the secret certificate-of-deposit-God, we want a doctor for our God who will give us and keep us in such a meritorious condition that we won't suffer much. And so long as that is the case, psychologically and sociologically and ethically, as my young friend has been telling you, we are not in a position to talk about the doctrine of the atonement very fully.

We must get back again and lash down close to the great suffering humanity about us until we become bone of its bone and flesh of its flesh once more; then, and not until then, shall we understand the atonement.

But having said that, what then is the fact of the atonement? We think of Jesus and that is the one to think of first of all; and thinking of him—and this is the point that I rose to say, which, if I do not say, I am afraid won't be said—thinking of Jesus, what made him suffer? How did he come to suffer? He suffered in this way: The moral-order-Jesus is the source of the real

agony of the moral-progress-Jesus. The atonement at bottom is the pain which the moral order of the world inflicts upon the moral progress of the world, and he is the full illustration of that. It was a terrible thing for Jesus, in a lonely moment, to have the moral order say to him, "Why, Jesus, you are wrong in what you are doing." That was the great suffering. "You are upsetting things that are good," the best men of his time said to him, and there were moments when the moral-order-Jesus, identical with the moral order outside of Jesus, took sides against the moral-progress-Jesus, and there was the keenest anguish which it is possible for a good man to suffer. It belongs to the very order of the world itself that the bearer of progress, of the higher ideal, should fall a victim to order, to the vulgar reality about him. But both moral order and moral progress are in God. Once more with the Fathers you must carry up the atonement as having its essential condition in Deity himself. God suffers. It is God the moral order that requires the atonement; but God the moral progress that makes it.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We will hear from Professor Franklin Johnson.

PROFESSOR FRANKLIN JOHNSON, D.D., Chicago, Ill.:

So far as I know, the New Testament seldom gives any theory of the atonement; it always speaks of the atonement simply as a fact, with one exception, and I am going to point out that exception presently. Equally certain is it that the New Testament nearly always regards the atonement as substitutionary. Now, it takes a vast amount of learning to put the fact of substitution out of the New Testament (laughter), and I have been edified and pleased somewhat to find some of my brethren avoiding that difficulty and saying that perhaps the writers of the New Testament did not know everything about it. Some of them might have been off their base a little when they were talking about that very immoral theory of substitution, or rather fact of substitution.

There is one passage, however, in which the apostle Paul broaches a theory, the only passage in the New Testament that does broach a theory, so far as I know; that is in the third chapter of Romans, at the twenty-fourth verse: "Being justified freely

by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God sent forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood to show his righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done beforetime in the forbearance of God, for the showing, I say, of his righteousness at this present season that he might himself be just and a justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus."

That is a somewhat complicated sentence, and I am very happy to avail myself of the exposition of it given by Dr. E. D. Burton of the Divinity School, in a series of numbered paragraphs of which I will read seven only:

1. In the ages before the coming of Christ, God passed over sins of men; i. e., he suffered them in part to go unpunished.

2. This passing over of sins was an act of forbearance on God's part; i. e., these sins deserved and might justly have received a punishment which they did not receive.

3. As a consequence of this passing over of sins in forbearance the righteousness of God came under suspicion; i. e., because God did not punish sin to the full, the impression was created in men's minds that God was indifferent to sin, was not pained by it, was not indignant at it.

4. Under these circumstances, accordingly, God's righteousness having been brought under suspicion by his forbearing to punish sin to the full, God made a public manifestation which had for its object the removal of this suspicion and the demonstration to men that he was righteous, that he was not indifferent to sin.

5. This public manifestation consisted in a setting forth of Jesus in his blood, i. e., in his death before the eyes of all the world. It need scarcely be said that not the visible spectacle of Jesus on the cross, but the fact viewed in its moral and historical significance is what is chiefly referred to.

6. That which this public setting forth of Jesus shedding his blood proved is something which was already true, but which having become obscured was in this event made manifest. This is implied in the choice of the words "set forth" and "showing," the latter made emphatic by its repetition. The death of Christ is in the view of our present passage a demonstration. God presents him to the view of men dying, not puts him to death. And this presentation demonstrates God's righteousness, not creates or satisfies it. God had not failed to be righteous, he had only failed, through forbearance, to convince men that he was righteous. The death of Jesus is a demonstration to the world that what seems true of God is not true, but that so far from being

indifferent to sin it is on the contrary a perpetual pain to him, that he perpetually disapproves it, is angry with it. At the same time the expression "that he might be righteous" implies that a perpetual "passing over" without "demonstration" would not only seem but be unrighteous.

7. In Jesus thus set forth in his blood, thus demonstrating God's righteousness, showing that God is not indifferent to sin, God provides himself a propitiation, i. e., makes it possible for him to show mercy toward those toward whom otherwise he would have been compelled to show wrath.

That is the first doctrine of the atonement ever announced. It comes by revelation at the very dawn of Christian history, and it is the last doctrine; it is distinctively the modern doctrine of the atonement which Spurgeon preached, which the Wesleys preached, which the New England theologians took hold of and presented with such cogency. It has its life in the very life of God, and it has its life in the very life of man.

It has been said that there are two great scandals in the administration of God; one is, that he allows sin, passes over sin; the other is that he forgives sin, and to avoid the misconstruction and the real unrighteousness which this might involve on his part, he himself suffers. He takes upon himself the agony and bears it to the full. That is my modern theory of the atonement.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We will hear from Professor G. B. Smith, of the University of Chicago.

PROFESSOR GERALD B. SMITH, Chicago, Ill.:

I am really here as an illustration of the fact that vicariousness in one form is not out of date, for my name was sent up by another. (Laughter.) However, I think all of us have certain profound convictions on this theme and I, too, have mine, although many of them have been already voiced in much better fashion than I could put the matter myself.

Not long ago I was taking lunch with two of my college classmates. One of them, a young lawyer of remarkably clean and upright life, who never drinks, smokes, or indulges in any of the personal vices, who is generous-hearted and open-minded and sympathetic to all that is good, said to me that when a few

years ago one of his fraternity men in college was through the seminary and was about to go into the ministry, he asked him what he was going to preach. The zealous reply was, "I am going to preach Christ and him crucified, and that alone." And this young lawyer said, "Oh, for pity's sake, don't do that."

Now, that is one type of modern mind. I asked him what was his objection to his friend's programme. He said, "If religion is going to help us today, you have got to talk to us in language that we understand. If you try to preach Christ crucified, you have to explain it to us by introducing a lot of New Testament exposition discussing the meaning of strange words, elucidating the significance of sacrifice, and all the rest. Now by the time you have done all this, Christianity seems unreal to us." I am not prepared to say how widely prevalent that particular type of modern thought is, but at any rate nothing could be more foreign to the New Testament ideal than to have the doctrine of the atonement so presented that it should make the Christian religion unreal to men.

Let us ask in what ways may it become unreal to men today? The doctrine of the atonement involves two primary conceptions—sin and God. What does sin mean to the modern man? It certainly does not mean what our systematic theologians define it to mean. Sin for the modern man grows out of the actual, social situation in which he finds himself. Sin is not thought of so much as an offense against God as it is an offense against men who deserve something better than to know oppression and greed. I suppose the most powerful book on sin which has appeared in the past few months has been written, not by a theologian at all, but by a man who is rather indifferent to theology. I refer to Professor Ross's *Sin and Society*. In that book the author sets forth in real and vivid language precisely the social sins which make our blood boil today. He has voiced modern thought on the subject.

Now, I think that the first step toward a modern statement of the doctrine of the atonement is to bring home to us comfortable professing Christians and church members something which turns out, strangely enough, to be quite parallel to the old doctrine of original sin. When you and I discover that by frequenting

bargain counters, by seeking investments for our money which shall bring quick returns, we have all unconsciously and thoughtlessly been sharing in a social sin which brings suffering and death to helpless men and women and children, there ought to lie upon our souls a burden which will lead us to cry out for redemption. That for one thing. We are coming into a new consciousness of sin. But it is not the theological sin. It is not the sin against an angry God, but the sin against humanity, mankind.

And then what about God? I suppose modern thought has very vague and far-away notions of the God who needed to be propitiated in the old sense. Modern thought thinks of our world and of the human race in terms of the doctrine of evolution. Modern thought must find its God not apart from the universe, watching over it, but in its very structure living out his life as his world grows and matures.

Now, the older theologians were very much afraid of what they called "patipassionism." It was thought essential to the immutability of God that he should not be permitted to suffer. Christ suffered; but not God. And yet even the doctrine of the immutability of God could not keep out of sight the religious certainty that if God is to be our God he must share the life of his children. Now, the God of modern thought is the immanent God, the God who is to work out his will and his purpose in this world. When we discover that we have been inflicting upon this growing world of humanity an irreparable wrong in our selfishness and our thoughtlessness, then we know that the God whose life is expressing itself in the life of his children must take upon himself the burden of our sin, and our atonement with him is purchased at tremendous cost.

Forgiveness, then, from the modern point of view, is going to seem like a more costly thing than from the old point of view. It demands the infinite sacrifice of the infinite God constantly. And we can know the meaning of that atonement only as—and this is Paul's thought—in union with the atoning God we ourselves shall take upon ourselves that work and feel the atoning power which can come only through—shall I say substitutionary suffering?—let us say vicarious suffering with redemptive power.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We have but two more of these short addresses, and I hope that all will remain. We have heard from three university men. We are now going to hear from a brother from Indianapolis, a Disciple; Rev. W. L. Hayden will please step to the platform.

REV. W. L. HAYDEN (Disciple), Indianapolis, Ind.:

It would be quite impossible for me to listen to so many most admirable addresses upon this most vital subject of the gospel and not feel inclined to say something. Unfortunately I made this remark and somebody sent up my name; that is why I am here. (Laughter.)

But now I want to say that I have been greatly delighted with the different phases of the subject that have been presented; many things I would like to say in emphasizing some parts of it, my time will not allow, and perhaps it is presumptuous in a man of my age, born perhaps the other side of the line that separates between the ancient and the modern thought (laughter) to attempt to translate anything in the Bible into modern thought. (Renewed laughter.) I think I would prefer to follow a little, and I am relieved from my embarrassment by the speaker who spoke next to the last one, who ventured to get somewhere near the divine thought in the matter.

It seems to me that in a great theme like this, while it is well for us to speak in such English that people can understand us, it is well enough that we get our thought as near to the divine expression as possible. Now, it is true that there is something said in the Bible that gives some basis for the different theories of atonement, but I was glad to hear the fact emphasized that it is in fact and not in theory that the achievement lies in the inspired word. I used to try to theorize about it when I began to preach. I could not do it very well. I learned some words from my professor; I couldn't use them very satisfactorily. (Laughter.) And I could not very well frame a theory that would fit all parts of it so it would be satisfactory to my own mind, so I concluded to confine myself to stating the facts about it in the Bible and in as plain English as I could and with as much heart



in it as I could, and so get the people to come under the power of the atonement of Christ.

I heard an old man say (he was old when he said it, and it was thirty years ago when I heard it) that there are but three facts in theology: the first is the greatness of God, the second is the wretchedness of man, and the third is the atonement in Christ. I think I may properly say *the* atonement. (Laughter.) I question a little about different atonements. And, if we can only understand that Christ is the great medium between God and men through which his power to reach and save our fallen race has to come to us, we need not in our thought limit the fact of the atonement of Christ to his death upon the cross—it means more than that. It means God's reaching us through his son in all the ways in which he touched humanity, and I suppose the greatest demonstration of his life and power was in the death of Jesus Christ upon the cross. Whether I can explain how that stands related to the law of God or not, has nothing to do with the question. We do understand that it stands in a very close relation to bringing a sinner to repentance, and I am inclined more and more, if I am going to limit it to any one part of it, to the moral influence of the atonement rather than to any other theory I have ever heard.

But now I want to say as I close, I have a thought about it; I think it is a modern thought. (Laughter.) Some time ago I knew a man who had a son he loved dearly who was just starting in a downward course. He had warned him and admonished him, and he was taken sick. The father was upon his bed of sickness for some time with a fever, and while he was sick he heard that this boy had been away in some place of dissipation. When the word came to him, his heart was almost broken. He said, "I wish you would go out and bring me in a rod." They brought it in and put it up in a corner near his bed. "I wish you would tell Charles to come in." He came in, and then he talked to him. "I understand you have been so and so, and so and so?" "Yes." "Didn't I tell you not to go?" "Yes." "Why did you go?" Well, he couldn't explain it very well. "Well," he said, "Charles, there is the rod. Take it, throw back the cover and lay it upon me until you are satisfied. If I have not suffered enough from you, put

it upon me until I do." Charles broke down and said he would not go any more.

I think when the Father was suffering, if God does suffer, it was in this way, to know that his son—shall I so speak? I believe that is the language of modern thought—had gone from him so far that he had to come down to him in the person of his only begotten Son and let men see what it caused him to suffer because of our lost race, and if that does not win men back to God, I do not think there is much hope for them.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We will listen now to the closing remarks by Rev. Samuel Batten, of Lincoln, Neb.

REV. SAMUEL ZANE BATTEN, Lincoln, Neb.:

*Mr. President, and Brethren:* There are some things that it seems are made very plain by the discussion this afternoon: First, that there is such a thing as the modern child. And another thing is that the older conception of the atonement, the older theories of the atonement, probably I had better say, have gone and have gone forever. They are simply unbelievable, they are simply unpreachable today. That being the case we are driven then to form some interpretation of that great fact, if we believe it is a fact, and we seek also some interpretation of it, and I want to say, brethren, that I believe that it will be a sad day for the church of Jesus Christ when doctrine is radical. What we need in our time is a great deal more theological thinking than we have now. It will be a sad time for the church when we no longer think in theological terms.

Now, I believe I come last on the programme this afternoon, and I suppose this is the time to sum up the discussions, and I am going to be presumptuous enough to sum up two or three of the things. Assuming that there is a modern child, assuming that there are certain terms in our modern thought, what are some of those elements?

First, that God is Father, that fatherhood defines the fundamental and the final relation between God and man.

Another thing is that Jesus Christ is the interpretation, you may say, of the very father-heart of God. Not only that, but it is in Jesus Christ that all things have been created, the life that

we have is life from him, and it is life in him. Not only so, but Jesus Christ reveals that which is essential and eternal in the life of God. He has not come to save us from God. He has not come to change God's attitude toward the human race. He has come, rather, to express that which is eternal in him, and we must say that every impulse of love and compassion that throbs in the heart of Jesus Christ throbs from eternity in the heart of God.

Then another thing that I think has been made plain here this afternoon is, that sin is breaking relations, or, looking at it from the other side in its personal aspect, we may say that sin is selfishness; it is the desire of the individual to make himself supreme, to break away from God, if he will break away from his fellows, to injure men, to care nothing for them.

And then one other thing: righteousness is a matter of right relations. If God is a righteous God, that means that God must be in certain relations with every creature of his, and they must be right relations. Now, if God is love, by the very essence of the term, God must love someone. We talk about love as though it were something in the air, some vague, some indefinite thing, but that is an impossible situation. If a man loves, he loves someone, and if God is love, God loves someone, and if God is to be a righteous God, he must remain in loving relations with his creatures.

Now, that is one side of it. What is the work, then, that Jesus Christ comes to do? What is the very essence, you may say, of the atonement? Assuming that the word means reconciliation, what is the work that Jesus Christ comes to do? For one thing, to reveal and interpret God to the world.

The devil had been slandering God. He had been saying to all mankind, as he said to our first parents, "Why has God forbidden you to eat at that tree? I will tell you why. God knows that if you eat of that tree you shall be as he is. Now, he is jealous of you. He lives for himself; he wants to keep you down. Now, the way for you to be like God is to assert yourself, to be free."

Jesus Christ has come to nail that lie of the devil, that God lives for himself; he has come to destroy that work of the devil.

Not only so, but he has come to reveal that very father-heart of God, God loving men, God seeking men, God suffering with men, God suffering for men. And we cannot think of a good God that did not suffer with his children if those children are in travail; we cannot conceive of a good God that did not give himself for them even unto death if that were necessary.

And then just one word with respect to sacrifice: What do we mean by it, brethren? It seems to me that the final thought is this: that self-sacrifice wherever you find it, whether in God or in man, is not merely refusing to do something that is pleasant to ourselves; that is only a very small part of it. It is the denial of our own self; it is the refusal to live for ourselves, in our choice of others, in our decision to live for all. And God is the God of self-sacrifice because God refuses to live in himself and for himself and chooses rather to live in and for and with his children.

Now, what is the work then that Jesus does, you say? He reveals God as he is; makes us know God's attitude toward us; makes us know that which is fundamental and final in God's being, and so he convicts us of sin. He makes us see that we have broken relations. We are not living as children ought to live before the Father. He makes us see that we are living in sin because when the Son came into the world we refused him and chose rather a murderer in his place, and, brethren, we never should have known what sin is in this universe but for the suffering and the death of Jesus Christ. We did not know that sin was such a dreadful thing as that. We had supposed it was simply pride, or some innocent thing like that. But sin was a blow at God. Man would have killed God if man could have reached him as men sold his Son in selfishness. In our determination to have our way, in our refusal of the life of God we were willing to send Jesus Christ to the cross.

Now, Jesus Christ, for one thing, then, convicts the world of sin. He makes us know what a dreadful thing sin is. And, brethren, I believe the church is right when the church has always said that there could be for man no salvation without the coming and the death and the sacrifice of Jesus Christ. Not that it was necessary for God to be placated, but without that revelation of

God in Jesus Christ, man would never have known God as he is. Man would never have known sin as it is. Man would never have been persuaded to put away his sin and come back to the Father. And so it was necessary, it could not have been otherwise in God's universe, that there must be such a revelation of God and such a revelation also of man that it is possible for God to forgive sin because it has been possible for man to repent of this sin.

And just one word more, brethren, which is this: What is the very essence of salvation? Going behind all terms now, what is the final thing? Just two statements: The possession of the mind of Christ is salvation; and the only salvation, my brother, that you can conceive of here or anywhere is the possession of the mind of Christ, and the man that has that has the real thing—the man that has the spirit of Christ, the man that is in harmony with God, the man that is in right relations with his fellows. And then it comes back to that other thought that righteousness is a matter of right relation and Jesus Christ has come to adjust the relations between man and God and between man and his brother.

Just one word, which is the word written by Livingston in Africa only a day or two possibly before his translation: "What is the atonement of Christ but himself? His own life and death and character revealing the infinite love of God for all his children, and drawing all men to himself, not by fear but by goodness."

PRESIDENT JACKSON: This evening at eight o'clock we come together again, and our theme for discussion is: "What Definite Steps Should Be Immediately Taken in the Organic Union of Baptists, Free Baptists, and Disciples of Christ?"

Let us rise and be dismissed with prayer by Dr. Van Doren.

The closing prayer having been uttered by Dr. Van Doren, an adjournment was taken until 8 o'clock P. M.

## SECOND DAY

*Evening Session*

November 11, 1908

8 o'clock P. M.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: The time has arrived for the opening of the evening services. Let us rise and sing together Hymn No. 95.

(The Congress rose and joined in singing Hymn No. 95)

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We will be led in prayer by Dr. Stockdale.

(The opening prayer was offered by Dr. Stockdale).

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We come together in this session of our Congress to discuss a question of deep interest to all of us: "What Definite Steps Should Be Immediately Taken in the Organic Union of Baptists, Free Baptists, and Disciples of Christ?" The first writer is Rev. I. J. Spencer, of Lexington, Ky. Will Mr. Spencer step forward and take the platform?

REV. I. J. SPENCER, LL.D., Lexington, Ky., read the following paper:

WHAT DEFINITE STEPS SHOULD BE IMMEDIATELY  
TAKEN TOWARD THE ORGANIC UNION OF  
BAPTISTS, FREE BAPTISTS, AND DISCIPLES OF  
CHRIST?

*Mr. President:* I esteem it a great privilege to make a plea for Christian union, especially as the religious bodies here represented are coming more and more to regard such a union as practicable. I am not responsible for the statement of my subject; but accepted it with the mental reservation that I would indicate the immediate spiritual, rather than mechanical, steps that ought to be taken.

I wish to be understood, however, as advocating organic union when we are ready for it. But as I believe in a change of heart before baptism, so I think the spirit of unity should be so cherished that it will easily find channels in which to flow. We do not want organic ecclesiasticism. Local church independency amounts to a "thus saith the Lord," with us.

I would take every step that can be taken wisely toward organic union, but I believe the forcing process should be applied inwardly rather than outwardly. The Christian plant is an endogen and not an exogen; it grows from within outward and not from without inward. If there be ice in the river and bitter winter in the air, it is useless to employ men to cut the ice for steamboat traffic. Before the sun in his journeying reaches his summer solstice the ice will melt and disappear. As Daniel Webster said of eloquence, so may we speak of Christian union: "It will come, if it come at all, like the outbursting of a fountain, with spontaneous, original, native force." Its springs are in heaven waiting for conduits in human hearts through which to flow down in blessing upon the world. Christian union, like Jacob's ladder, the New Jerusalem and every good gift, comes down from above. Everything is beautiful in its time. And there is a season for every purpose under heaven.

Having married a couple on a certain occasion, I was asked by the bride how I liked the groom. When I had answered, she said: "The reason I ask is because I never met him myself until Tuesday." You will not be surprised to hear that they separated.

The only proper way to approach this theme is in the *spirit of prayer*. We cannot advance except upon our knees. The failure of unions made prematurely and unwisely admonish us. Jesus himself approached it thus. He prayed to the Father. He did not argue with the apostles. The same love that brought him to the cross brought him to that prayer. It was a peculiar spiritual oneness for which he offered his petition. It was not union in any *thing*, but union in him personally and in the Father. The spiritual union, however, was to be so tangible, visible, spectacular, and uncontradictable; so simple, commendable, impressive, magnetic, and gracious, that even the wicked world, seeing it, would be won to Christ its divine center.

The plea of the apostle Paul to the brethren in Ephesus to "keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace" immediately and logically followed the record of his wonderful prayer to the Father that they might be strengthened by the Holy Spirit and be filled with all the fulness of God. We know that the spirit desires union; and to be led of the spirit is not to be forced apart

from, but tenderly drawn toward, the brethren. We must not wait for union to come like "irresistible grace." We must devoutly seek it.

The next step I would suggest is to create a profound and universal conviction of the sin of divisions in the church of God. The writer of the Epistles to the Corinthians idealizes his brethren as "sanctified," "called to be saints," but yet really "carnal" or unspiritual and only "babes" in Christ, because they were contentious. Some said they were of Paul, some of Peter, and others of Apollos. He asks, even as the heathen are asking over our sectarian divisions, "Is Christ divided?" "Was Paul crucified for you?" Will anyone dare to exalt a doctrine, a person, or a name—even the name of an apostle—instead of the Crucified? "Were ye baptized in the name of Paul?" Baptism, brethren, is nothing except for the name of Christ. Therefore the apostle was glad that he had baptized none of the Corinthians, save only a few, lest any should say they had been baptized in the name of Paul. Then this spiritual physician seeing that as yet they were only babes in grace, and suffering from that children's disease, division, from which strong men in Christ are immune, prescribed the very milk of the gospel: "Christ crucified . . . the power of God and the wisdom of God." He further declares that he had determined not to know *anything* among them save Jesus crucified. As Saint Paul wrote, in another epistle, that he counted all things as refuse for Christ, so should every denominational leader in Christendom today. I said recently, to the astonishment of some of my friends, that the only hindrance to union and co-operation between Baptists and Disciples is ignorance or sin. I give as authority the third chapter of First Corinthians. The sin of "carnality"—or the ignorance of spiritual babyhood caused the trouble. The knowledge of Christ and his sole exaltation was the remedy in Corinth and will be in America. This, along with the removal of misunderstandings among the brethren here represented, would lead to such an affectionate co-operation as would convince the world that there is a new power in Christianity. I think the masses of our people are profoundly ignorant of the doctrinal views one of the other. I cannot think the trouble is perversity. This leads me to advocate another essen-



tial step, namely, religious *education* of the masses. There are a million Disciples of Christ not yet enlisted in our general missionary movement. I suppose there are three million Baptists not yet co-operating with their great missionary enterprises. It should be an education not only in the great truths of Christianity, but in the organization, mission, motive, and universal progress of the church abroad and at home. The Roman Catholics are far ahead of us in teaching their religion. Our children are in the Bible school one hour a week. Theirs are taught their religion six days out of seven. Perhaps nothing is so strategic and pivotal in all our churches as religious education such as I have named.

If it were voted in a great national convention of the three bodies here represented to join forces, how long would it be until the remote districts would get the news and get it straight? It took a hundred years of mistaken instruction to get and keep us apart. God grant that within less than ten years the teaching of Christ and the cry of the heathen may bring us together. Nevertheless let us not be impatient or grow weary in well-doing.

Take two illustrations of misconception on the part of Baptists and Free Baptists concerning doctrinal points in the teaching of the Disciples. One is the design of baptism, and the other the operation of the Holy Spirit. It has been said that from the Baptist standpoint these are the chief doctrinal differences between them and the Disciples. Now of course no one person, nor even ten thousand persons, can speak authoritatively as to what Baptists, Free Baptists, or Disciples do actually believe. But so far as I know the position of the Disciples on these two subjects I will here state it, in order to a better understanding of the same.

In connection with faith and repentance baptism is a divinely appointed condition of membership in the church, the body of Christ in whom alone we have the remission of sins, the gift of the Holy Spirit, and eternal life. We do not believe in baptismal regeneration, but in spiritual regeneration through Christ symbolized in baptism. We do not preach, "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins;" but, "Repent and be baptized *into the name of Jesus Christ* unto the remission of sins." It is not baptism that saves, but the *name of Christ* only. There is no other name under heaven given among men whereby we may be saved.

Ananias did not say to Saul at Damascus, "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins;" but, "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins calling *upon the name of the Lord*." For it is written, "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved;" not, whosoever is baptized shall be saved. The name of the Lord is the essential, meritorious, and effectual consideration in connection with baptism and the remission of sins. That fact was the reason why the apostle Paul was glad he had baptized so few in Corinth lest any should say he had baptized in his own name. If Paul had believed in so-called "baptismal regeneration" he would never have so said.

And concerning the Holy Spirit we believe that he was sent to convict the world of sin, righteousness, and the judgment; that he testifies not of himself but of Christ and reveals his will. He dwells in the believer, and, if permitted, will abide with him in exceeding fulness; helping his infirmities and making intercession for him according to the will of God. He enlightens, quickens, regenerates, leads, comforts, teaches, strengthens the believer with might in the inner man; works in him to will and to do the divine pleasure; seals sanctifies, and keeps him in living union with Christ. No greater gift can be granted to any man than the gift of the Spirit of God. Although he uses the word of God in conversion and sanctification we believe he also works through prayer, through Providence and godly persons; and we would in no wise limit his operations to the word or to methods which we can analyze and comprehend.

I am sure I express the essential conviction of the great majority of my brethren, the Disciples, in the foregoing statements of doctrine, although many of them might use different verbiage and come closer to the full teaching of Scripture on the subject than I have done. I shall not venture or presume to state the views of my Baptist brethren on these points for comparison.

As Dr. Charles H. Dodd suggests, the story of two passengers in an old-fashioned stage-coach, having entered at different stations and traveling together as strangers in the night, but who discovered in the morning that they were brothers, illustrates the fact that we, too, have been riding side by side over the long,

sad night-ways; but the daybreak reveals the truth that we are brethren.

Another step to real and abiding union in Christ is *lowliness*. Without it men will not learn nor be advanced. The spirit of docility, humility, and willingness to serve is strategic. When the oft-recurring query arose in the little group of apostles as to who should be the greatest, Jesus made a little child reprove them for their pride and self-seeking. On the night of his agony in the Garden, just preceding his prayer for his disciples and their union in him, he taught the most picturesque and beautiful lesson of humility. Simon Peter never forgot it and, years afterward, writing to his brethren of the dispersion, he said: "All of you gird yourselves with humility to serve one another; for God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble."

Let us remember that it was only through the most obedient humiliation that Jesus came to his exaltation, to the name above every name, and the worship above every worship. His church can reach its glory and its sphere among the nations only as it girds itself with humility and is willing to serve. Joseph Cook declared truly that "the church of the future is the church willing to wash the feet of the lowliest saints." Still another essential, without which organic union would fail, is *the love of God*. This love is the best proof of a regenerate church membership. Would it not indicate more love for the three bodies mentioned to join ranks than to remain separate? Does the world think that any custom, history, tradition, or any mere segment of doctrine is worthy of a place as exalted as Christ? Have any of us been baptized into any name but the name of Christ? If so I am sure it was "alien immersion," without the promise of the Holy Spirit, and such a subject needs not a *re-baptism* but a *real baptism* into the name of Christ. Did not our Lord inquire, when he made Simon Peter a shepherd, as well as a fisherman, concerning this greatest thing in the world, a regnant love for the personal Christ?

Soon after the Chicago fire I saw a large mass of steel tools, iron instruments, and implements that had been melted together in the heat of that fierce conflagration. The peculiar character of each could be recognized, but the individual parts could not be separated. So when the love of God shall have melted our hearts

they will cohere in Christ and no doctrine nor doctor of divinity can force them apart. As illustrating the fact that love represents the manhood of the church and the Christian, Paul says: "When I was a child I spake as a child; I thought as a child. But when I became a man I put away childish things." When love is wanting "we see through a glass darkly," but when it prevails "we see face to face." Is our manhood still delaying?

Another step in the process of the right kind of getting together is superlative *loyalty to Christ*. As the spokes of a wheel approach each other as they approach the hub, so do we as we draw near in loyalty to our Lord. It means his absolute and exclusive supremacy. Elijah and Moses must disappear from the vision and Jesus only abide. You cannot serve God and denomination. You cannot be suffered even to bid farewell to sectarian leaders that are in the rear. You cannot in safety go back to bury your own history, traditions, and shibboleths. Let the dead bury their dead. If any man hate not his father's creed and his mother's sect he is not worthy of his Lord. Except a man forsake all that he hath he cannot be Jesus' disciple. Except he sell all, he cannot buy the priceless pearl.

But one says: "I cannot conscientiously sacrifice my principles for the sake of union." Brethren, if any man's principles stand between him and Christian union then the sooner he adopts a new set of principles the better. Whatever is my own I may give away. My ignorance, prejudice, bigotry, jealousy, idolatry, or pride, I may freely and legitimately surrender. But the glorious gospel, given me in trust, I must sacredly administer. Jesus himself was never loyal to any mere thing. He never centered himself and his disciples about any point or segment of truth. He was loyal to the Father. All authority is his and where he speaks we speak; and where he is silent we are silent.

Still another imperative step is Christian *liberty*. I imagine I hear some persons say: "We are Baptists, Free Baptists, and Disciples of Christ and were never in bondage to any man. Liberty is one of the foremost principles of our religion." But if ye were free ye would not resist his will, obstruct the answer to his prayer, and put him to shame before the world. Whom God hath set free is free indeed and none can bind; and whom he hath

bound none can set free. That may sound like Calvinism; but it was not so intended. Certain it is that the best freemen in Christ have been his best bond-servants from the days of Paul until now. In speaking of the providential meaning of the present movement toward unity, Dr. Dodd of Baltimore quotes Prince Albert as saying: "Young men, find out God's plan in your generation and fall in with it." And then he adds: "We are caught in nothing less than the flood-tide of the Holy Spirit's fulfilling will. . . . I see nothing half so supernatural in this day of ours as this impulse toward fraternity and solidarity. It is impossible to resist it. I look upon it as the spiritual miracle of the times."

From India, China, and Japan comes the pathetic cry: "We would see Jesus!" and the Master, pleased, said the hour had come that he should be glorified. But instead of presenting Christ, who makes free, men lift up their denominational standards that obscure the view. The orientals want unity in the faith and get division. But as someone has said: "We cannot export what we do not import." The Japanese say: "We are poor and cannot afford your American luxury of division. We want a united church of Christ in Japan."

The man of Macedonia still stands across the sounding seas and calls for help. "Give us loaves!" the heathen cry, and we answer: "Trouble me not. The door is now shut and my denominational children are with me in bed. I cannot rise and give thee." But the importunate cry sounds on and waxes louder and louder. It haunts our dreams. It troubles our conscience. Let us, in God's name arise and give them "as many as they need." How suggestive is the determination of the apostles and elders and the whole church in Jerusalem—this erstwhile narrow and bigoted church—to send fraternal delegates to Antioch to carry a lowly, loving, loyal, and liberty-breathing message: "It seemeth good to the Holy Spirit, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things." And how the whole church at Antioch "rejoiced for the consolation." Let us deal likewise one with another.

Briefly I would suggest the following recommendations:

1. Let us heed the missionaries' pleading that the denomina-

tions of the West shall not be bound upon the East. Let us encourage our missionary boards to promote union in every place where it shall seem wise and commendable.

2. Let us confirm all those who have gone forward to Christian union, and rejoice in the moral and spiritual transformations resulting from such union. In western Canada, for example, confirmed skeptics have been converted through it and are now teaching in Sunday schools.

3. Let us inaugurate a great campaign of education among our people—an exchange of pulpits, of Bible-school literature, of fraternal delegations to all our missionary gatherings; an exchange of writers for the pages of our religious journals; an exchange of cheering missionary tidings, and a free exchange of our religious editors.

4. Let us resolve to be courteous always, and to practice the whole of the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians, item by item.

Let us send to each other whole baskets of the delicious, beautiful, and wholesome fruits of the Spirit and determine that never again will we misrepresent one another. And let us remember that no writer has any authority to speak or act for the Baptists, Free Baptists, or Disciples, and that we should not hold the entire body to account for what one of its members does or says. It is not scientific. It is not legal. It is not scriptural. It is not fair. Rather, do as some of us used to do down in Kentucky: hold each man personally responsible for himself only.

5. I rejoice with you all at the overtures of the Baptists and Free Baptists, which they made after the adjournment yesterday, to the Disciples to join their Congress on equal terms, in every way, and thus to make it both ours and theirs.

I am happy, too, at the hearty, prompt, and unanimous acceptance on the part of the Disciples present—both sides voting unanimously to recommend the coalition to all who are absent but have a voice in the management of either institution.

So may it be that, whether Baptists, Free Baptists, or Disciples, "all are yours and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's." He that heareth these sayings of Christ concerning union and doeth them is wise and is building upon the Rock.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: The next speaker, Rev. Carter E. Cate, of Providence, R. I., is absent, I understand. There is some explanation, I believe, which the Secretary will make.

THE SECRETARY: It is very unfortunate that we should ever have a failure in the Congress programme. It happens very seldom, I am proud to say. It is exceedingly unfortunate that one of the three men, each of whom was appointed to represent his own denomination, has failed. The following letter was received after my arrival in this city:

158 Elmwood avenue, PROVIDENCE, R. I.

November 7, 1908

*Theo. A. R. Gessler, D.D., Landing, N. J.:*

DEAR BROTHER: I regret exceedingly that on account of sickness I shall not be able to attend the Congress in Chicago next week.

Cordially yours,

CARTER E. CATE

PRESIDENT JACKSON: Before the address of Brother Crandall, we will have a word from Doctor Gates.

PROFESSOR ERRETT GATES:

I have been asked by the treasurer of the Baptist committee to take his place in a brief statement to you regarding the financial needs of the Congress committee. I suppose I am asked to do this in his place because a new broom sweeps a little cleaner, and out of this splendid audience tonight it seems to me that we ought to receive an abundance, a superabundance of help to put the Executive Committee of the Baptist Congress squarely upon its feet in this matter.

Do you know that every good and great thing costs something? Everything that is desirable and worth while to you, you pay for; and the cheapest thing, the least expensive thing in all your life, you will bear me witness, is your religion. Everything else costs more, the house you live in, the clothes you wear, the splendid dinners you give, the theaters you go to; everything else costs you more than your religion. It has cost something to bring these splendid representatives from the various denominations to this platform. We have concentrated here and boiled down the selected intelligence and piety of three denominations: the finest

collection of speakers and thinkers I think I have ever been in the presence of upon a Christian platform. What is it costing you? Your car fare down here? It ought to cost you more than that.

And then it is worth something also to get the testimony which we Disciples have been seeking from you Baptists that you are not afraid of us. It was a supreme and a sublime act of confidence in the Disciples on the part of your Baptists that you threw open your arms and the splendid programme of this Congress, and said, "Come in and say anything you want to say. Tell your story about baptism and the operation of the Holy Spirit. Come in. If you have anything distinctive and peculiar in your doctrines to state, we Baptists will give you a chance to state them." And, I think, this good Baptist brotherhood has demonstrated that they are no longer afraid of us. They were afraid of us seventy-five or one hundred years ago. They closed church doors on us then, but we are now entering upon a new epoch. The Baptists are now *opening* church doors, and bigger doors than the church doors; they are opening *congress* doors, which represent many churches.

And, as a Disciple of Christ, this occasion is a kind of confirmation of long-deferred hopes—an answer to prayers that have been ascending from my heart for many years, and I am willing to help pay for it all. It is worth something, this demonstration, this testimony that has been given us by our Baptist brethren.

And now, if the ushers will come forward and will wait upon the audience, I feel sure that your response will be equal to the speech I have made. (Laughter.)

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We have a provision in our rules of order for voluntary speakers; and in case anyone would like to address the meeting upon the theme of the meeting, it will be necessary for him to send his name to the Secretary and when he speaks for him to come to the platform. I hope that while the next speaker is addressing us, several will send their cards forward. I will ask Dr. Johnson on this side of the house and Dr. Gates on the other side of the house to walk down the aisle and bring a little moral and physical suasion to bear upon these friends to address us at the close of Dr. Crandall's address.



You will now listen to Dr. Crandall, who was at one time pastor of this church and who is now at Minneapolis.

REV. L. A. CRANDALL, D.D. (Baptist), Minneapolis, Minn.:

With the indulgence of this flint-hearted Secretary who looks at his watch before I begin, I want to say some thing before I begin, and I will say it, not to the Congress but to such members of the Memorial Church of Christ and Baptists and Disciples as may be present here tonight.

I had the honor to be pastor of some of these people for twelve years. I cannot stand on this platform tonight without feelings of the profoundest emotion. I saw these walls rise, brick by brick. I built my life into the life of some of these people for long years and I have a word that I want to say in order that all conjecture concerning my own attitude toward this union may be put at rest. It is this: If in the providence of God I should be seized by those fatal ministerial diseases, sore throat and a swollen bank account, so that I should be compelled to give up the continuance of the Christian ministry and move to Chicago, I should take great delight in putting my letter into this church.

I believe in the organization. I love many of the men and women whom I have known through many years; and I should love all the rest, I am sure, if I only had a chance, and I hold in respect and hold in the warmest place in my heart the honored pastors of this organization.

Having said this much, I proceed to the discussion of the question before us. If anybody has any doubt as to my attitude in the matter, I will relieve their minds at the close if they will approach me personally.

#### WHAT IMMEDIATE STEPS CAN BE TAKEN TOWARD ORGANIC UNION BETWEEN BAPTISTS, FREE BAPTISTS, AND DISCIPLES?

The only relief afforded to the unhappy victim who, in a moment of weakness, has consented to write upon this subject, lies in the suggestion implicit in that word "steps." This little monosyllable indicates that the framers of the question simply desire to know how the task of bringing three distinct ecclesiastical bodies into organic unity may be begun. They have fixed

no time limit, neither do they specify how many steps may be taken; for all of which one reader, at least, is profoundly grateful.

It is not difficult to point out the evils arising from the divisions of Christendom. No abnormal degree of perspicuity is required to recognize the weakness and inefficiency directly traceable to sectarianism. The beauty of fraternalism, the strength that comes from unity, the undying pathos of our Lord's plea that his disciples should be one—all this has been set forth in eloquent speech and repeatedly. To every plea for the unity of Christendom we devoutly say "Amen and Amen!"

But it is one thing to fill the soul with entrancing visions and quite another to realize them. The question as to desirability is easily settled, but that of possibility still remains to perplex us. The Ways and Means Committee never lacks something to do. When the orator has finished his impassioned plea leaving the hearts of his hearers glowing with desire, the little word, "how?" thrusts itself to the front to dampen ardor and compel thoughtfulness. The question before us is not to be answered by rhetoric, however brilliant. It is cold and merciless, summoning us out of the realm of imagination and dreams to the calm, passionless consideration of facts.

Organic union is a life process. Bodies may be one in law and two in fact. We are all familiar with the process of grafting by which two living forms are made to share a common life, and we have also seen the Christmas evergreen bearing oranges. In one case the union was vital, in the other mechanical. Legislation cannot produce organic union. Ecclesiastical bodies generated and developed by antagonistic convictions, bodies which hold to interpretations of the teaching of Jesus that differ fundamentally, cannot become one in fact, no matter what is decided by ecclesiastical vote. All growth is from within. Any real progress in the unification of Christendom must follow this law.

This is not saying that all Christians must think alike and believe alike before Christ's prayer for unity can be answered. Absolute uniformity means deadly monotony. Paul was not a replica of Peter and James and John; brothers in the flesh as well as in the gospel of the Son of God differed sharply in personal characteristics. Each leaf of the tree has its individuality differ-

entiating it from every other leaf, but they are all organically united. When two brethren agree exactly on every point of doctrine it is safe to assume that one of them is more chameleon than man. It is as foolish to seek exact duplicates in the Kingdom of God as in nature. The unity which we seek is not of identity but in diversity.

Having said this, we are only at the beginning of our troubles. How much and how vital diversity may coexist with real unity? What are the fundamentals upon which there must be agreement? To pass from the general to the specific, is there such agreement among the denominations named in the question before us as admits of organic unity? The answer that comes back is a mixture of negatives and affirmatives, and it may take a "rising vote" to determine which party is in the majority. It will not do to assume that all who vote in the negative are pugnacious irreconcilables. Such there are in every denomination; men who worship God by abusing their brethren, to whom mote-pulling is the supreme business of life and whose confidence in their own omniscience never faileth. But there are many of kindly disposition, lovers of their brethren, fair-minded, manly men, who sincerely believe that the differences between us are so radical that organic union is impossible. No real organic union can ever be brought about until the great majority of each body is convinced that we are already essentially one in our interpretation of Christian truth.

So far as this question concerns Baptists and Free Baptists it is now being answered. State organizations in each denomination have already voted or will soon vote upon a proposition which contemplates the unification of the missionary operations of the two bodies. If the vote be favorable, we may expect the prompt consolidation of denominational agencies in home and foreign missionary operations. When this has been accomplished union of local bodies will follow as a matter of course. Should union in missionary operations not be effected at the present time, organic union of the two bodies would be delayed but not permanently defeated. Ecclesiastical unity must, sooner or later, grow out of essential unity. That such essential unity now exists

between the two denominations named is the profound conviction of the great majority in each body.

At but two points have Baptists and Free Baptists ever disagreed. We must not forget the views of Benjamin Randall, founder of the Free Baptist denomination, views which made him *persona non grata* to his Baptist brethren of the latter half of the eighteenth century, had become very generally accepted by Baptists by the middle of the nineteenth century. This is no unauthorized guess, but the testimony of our most trusted historians. Benedict, writing in 1848, says, "We must bear in mind that all were set down as Arminians who did not come up to the highest point of hyper-Calvinism. Our old ministers in this region, half a century since, would have denounced as unsound in the faith, the great mass of our community of the present day, both in Europe and America, Fuller and Hall among the rest." This same Baptist historian points to hyper-Calvinism as one of "the three great evils among Baptists," and says that it "has been the bane of the denomination for about two centuries past." The original cause of division exists only as a memory. The dogma which consigned non-elect infants dying in infancy to endless torments is found now only in museums for theological antiquities.

The only other question over which these denominations have contended concerns the ordinance of the Lord's Supper. Here also time has done its work. Fifty years ago the "communion question" was a live issue, but it is such no longer. In spite of the fundamental Baptist doctrine of "soul-liberty," and our insistence upon the autonomy of the local church, the hand of fellowship was withdrawn from churches that practiced open-communion, and when George F. Pentecost administered the sacred emblems to the kindly Quakeress, Sarah Smiley, he was left in no doubt as to the desirability of changing his ecclesiastical relations. But yesterday is not today. Slowly but surely Baptists have come to practice what they have all the time professed, and to leave to each church the conduct of its own affairs and to the individual his right of private judgment.

Turning now to the consideration of organic union between the Baptists and the Disciples of Christ, we find ourselves confronted with serious difficulties in attempting to determine the

likeness or unlikeness of these two bodies. Neither denomination has an authoritative confession of faith. Each insists that the Bible is the only "rule of faith and practice." We may not lay the creed of one alongside the creed of another and arrive at our conclusions by comparative study, for neither body confesses to the ownership of any such article. Creeds have been made for Baptists, but Baptists as a denomination have not made any creed. In our quest for information as to that which differentiates Baptists or Disciples from other communions or from each other we must trust to individual expressions in literature or conversation; expressions that may or may not be representative.

Passing by, as unimportant, minor differences in church procedure, let us come directly to the consideration of the chief obstacle in the way of organic union of these two denominations. In writing to Rev. J. H. Shakespeare of London, secretary of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, but a few weeks ago, I ventured to ask his opinion of the wisdom of inviting the Disciples of Christ to join in the meeting of the Baptist World Alliance to be held in this country in 1911. In reply he said that if the Disciples in America hold to baptismal regeneration, as do the Disciples of Great Britain, English Baptists would not favor such invitation. The assertion that English Disciples believe in baptismal regeneration is his assertion, not mine.

Frank statement has ever characterized the utterances made on the platform of this Congress, and the settlement of the question before us is not to be brought about by the suppression of real issues or by mere billing and cooing. The whole history of Baptists has been a protest against sacramentarianism, and Baptists of today are even more settled in their opposition than were their fathers. Nothing is more repugnant to the profoundest convictions of Baptists than the assumption that the regeneration of a human soul is produced by a physical substance or an outward ceremony. Personally, I have no doubt that the great majority, if not all, of our Disciple brethren share in this hostility. The men in the Disciple ministry who have honored me with their friendship seem to lay as much stress upon the necessity of spiritual renewal as do Baptists. But declarations born of the heat of doctrinal controversies are on record which seem to

commit this or that Disciple leader and teacher to views regarding the efficiency of baptism in which Baptists could not share. The writer in preparing this paper took occasion to ask a Disciple friend this question: "Do Disciples believe in baptismal regeneration?" The answer was "No; but some of our people have used expressions which come pretty close to it."

After this not altogether purposeless meandering, let us come directly to the question under discussion.

I. As a practical illustration of that which may be done and is now being done toward organic union of the bodies under consideration, permit me to call attention to action taken at the recent meeting of the Minnesota Baptist State Convention. After voting unanimously to approve of the proposed consolidation of the work being done by the national home and foreign mission societies of Baptists and Free Baptists, this body adopted, with but one dissenting vote, the following resolutions:

*First*, differences, if still existing, may be left where the New Testament leaves them, to the teaching of the Scriptures under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

*Second*, it is recommended that the constitution of the Minnesota Baptist State Convention be so amended as to admit to membership Free Baptists on the same terms as Baptists.

*Third*, that the Missionary work of the Minnesota Free Baptist Meeting be adopted and carried on by the Minnesota Baptist State Convention, as the missionary agent of the two bodies thus united.

It was also provided that this union shall go into effect January 1, 1909, or as soon afterward as ratified by both of the parties concerned. It will be seen by this action that so far as the Baptists and Free Baptists of Minnesota are concerned, organic union is likely to change from a theory to a condition in the immediate future.

Not quite content with this step toward union, the Minnesota convention adopted the following minute regarding relations with the Disciples of Christ:

Recognizing the growing sense of unity quite generally manifest between Baptists and Disciples of Christ, and believing that this sentiment, so in harmony with the spirit and purpose of our Lord, and so essential to the complete evangelization of the world, should be fostered

and encouraged in every possible way; therefore, we representatives of the two bodies named, in the state of Minnesota, do hereby propose the following resolutions, as indicating a program of possible co-operation and affiliation:

1. That in the future we avoid the duplication of churches in towns and villages where there is not a manifest need for two churches, and that in locating churches in the larger cities we each have regard for the territory previously occupied by the other body.

2. That in places where both bodies are represented by organized churches, and where it is evident that one could do the work better than two, we encourage their union upon some basis to be mutually agreed upon by the local congregations, in conference with chosen representatives of each state body, and that we pledge our hearty support to all such undertakings.

3. That in places where one body has a church and the other has none, each encourage unaffiliated members to unite with the local church, with the full understanding that they have the right to hold individual judgments regarding matters of opinion and practice wherein the two bodies may seem to differ.

4. That we encourage also every movement looking toward the closer mutual acquaintance of the two bodies by holding union services whenever and wherever expedient, by frequent exchange of pulpits, by fraternal greetings extended through chosen representatives of each body in the general state gatherings of the other body, by open and platform discussion of the questions involved in the union of the two, and by all other means calculated to promote the cause for which our Lord so earnestly prayed.

It will be seen that this does not propose immediate organic union, but it seeks a state of affairs definitely better than those now existing. It is needless to say that two immersionist bodies cannot occupy the same place at the same time without resultant friction. They appeal to the same constituency, and they are so much alike that each wonders at the obtuseness or obstinacy of the other. Both are eager and aggressive, and clashing is inevitable. We of Minnesota are undertaking to declare a truce from warfare. We propose to try to understand each other better with the distinct hope in our hearts that we shall learn in the near future that no valid reasons exist why we should live apart.

2. If we would put on the three-league boots of progress toward organic unity, let us be kindly in our judgments. We are

brethren, not ecclesiastical Irishmen armed with shillalahs, exercising ourselves at a Donnybrook Fair. Let us assume the best about each rather than the worst. Why take it for granted that nothing good can possibly come out of the Baptist or of the Disciple Nazareth? If a Disciple church and a Baptist church find that they are in practical accord and decide that the interests of Christ's kingdom can be served by their union, why not await the result of the experiment in a spirit of kindness and good-will, instead of calling them harsh names and clubbing them over the head with ecclesiastical bludgeons? You cannot convert a soul from the error of its ways with an axe. It is quite possible, also, that events may abundantly justify the union, and we shall be found fighting against God. Is it not conceivable that while union between Baptists and Free Baptists begins with the general organizations and proceeds toward the local church, union between Baptists and Disciples may commence at the other end of the line?

Nothing will so surely and so rapidly promote organic unity as the growth, in all of our hearts, of the mind which was in Christ Jesus. When we come to be like him in all things we shall be like each other. Then will the high-priestly prayer be answered, and the unity of life will reveal itself in unity of organization. For the speedy coming of that hour let us hope and pray and labor.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: I am very glad to say that I have the names of six gentlemen here and perhaps that is as many as we can hear from tonight; that is, gentlemen who are willing to address us upon this theme, and they are all leaders of their denominations. First I will ask Dr. Joseph William Mauck, who is president of the general conference of the Free Baptists and Vice-president of this Congress, to address you.

DR. JOSEPH W. MAUCK, LL.D., Hillsdale, Mich.;

No one can regret more than myself the absence of Dr. Cate who was appointed to represent in a formal way the Free Baptists upon this discussion. With the sincere hope that the illness reported is not serious, I will venture to make the suggestion that it may be providential that the Free Baptists are shut out from the argument here because they have been so very ably represented in the discussion. Because yesterday our good friend from



Kentucky who had the first paper of the evening was kind enough to say that he got his first instruction in Greek from a Free Baptist college; and I believe there is a brother editor among the colleges who has suggested recently that Dr. Crandall was at one time a Free Baptist and had not altogether gotten over it. Dr. Crandall, whom I knew so intimately in college, when he was a Free Baptist, full-fledged, not only by profession but by birth, has so ably presented the matter that I feel the Free Baptists have been treated very fairly indeed.

I told the Doctor this evening I would not do anything more than to say I had known him intimately in college and I would not go any farther than that, nor rehearse against him the sins of his youth. (Laughter.)

It was about one year ago in a beautiful church and before a great audience in the city of Baltimore that I had the honor of reading a paper upon this very theme. Had I known that Dr. Cate was to have been absent, I would have been tempted perhaps to telegraph for the manuscript and spring that upon you tonight in his stead, but you will be mercifully spared.

As to what the next step should be, I am admonished by what was said about a year ago tonight, that the steps that were then suggested have in some measure already been taken and that we stand tonight regarding this question upon advanced ground as compared with one year ago. I should think, then, in the first place, that the next step should be more of the same kind.

A matter of history which will apply to our good Disciple brethren is now recalled as arising in the deliberations of the Committee of Twelve from the Free Baptist and the Disciples in conference in the city of Brooklyn three years ago, when two members of the Free Baptist committee had believed that the line of least resistance on the matter of denominational union would be with them, that they themselves, after a conference, graciously agreed that the Free Baptists should discontinue for a time their deliberations with them and try out the question with the Baptists first. Why was it? It was primarily because there was not between the two bodies that personal acquaintance, the members of one with the members of the other, which is after all the prime condition of any union in my judgment. That was the unanimous

conclusion, I believe, of twenty-four men who had been appointed by their respective national bodies.

Taking that as a suggestion, I would say that one of the next steps is to have another congress like this. With all due regard to the editors of papers and addresses without papers which have been presented here, I venture the assertion that more progress has been made on the matter of the union of these three bodies back in the lobbies and in these halls and at the hotels, and in our homes, since yesterday morning than even by the programme itself, because there we find enriched and liberalized the personal acquaintance without which there can be no organic union. Since coming into this meeting this afternoon I have been exceedingly gratified by what I believe is a public notice that the Disciple brethren have accepted the invitation, if it has been given, for the other two bodies to be united in this Baptist Congress. I believe it was some broad-minded liberal Baptist that suggested there might be a change in the organization and possibly in the name of the Baptist Congress, in order that we might here all three be represented. I devoutly hoped and expressed the hope that such would not be the case. Certainly one of the most fruitful sources of division and of a continuance of division has been a pride in name. "Oh, we love the old name so much." It is so difficult for us in effecting any organization to decide upon that one thing which after all is only incidental. When we can, as Disciple and Free Baptist, without a change of name, come in and work under another name, a name of our older and larger brethren, we will have given a concrete example of what it means to push to the rear the mere matter of name.

We all talk about it on the platform, but so far as I am concerned, I hope in these future congresses, Mr. President, we shall have the privilege of discussing this matter in the Baptist Congress.

I may say again that in that union, to which Dr. Crandall has referred, which gives promise of early fruitage between the Baptists and the Free Baptists, when the Free Baptists come in to you brethren to become a part of you, they expect to be known as Baptists. They expect that that distinguishing word, which formerly was "Free Will," one syllable of which was cut

off some years ago on the part of a good many of us, will possibly be elided and we shall be known as Baptists.

If there shall come a time when the other people should come in and not be called Baptists, and we then—we Baptists, as we will all be then, we two Baptists—if we see fit then to change the name, that is a matter for the future. Upon that I am entirely indifferent myself.

A rather startling suggestion was made to me just before I came into the building, that, in suggesting steps to be taken hereafter, I should undertake to enlighten some of the people here as to the nature of the proposed union between the Free Baptists and the Baptists, as being a starting-point for a clearer understanding of the situation as it is between those two bodies, because this brother said he knew of a number, probably fifteen clergymen, who had no idea as to the character of the proposed basis of union between the two bodies upon which the Baptist conventions and the constituent bodies of the Free Baptists' general conference are now taking action.

Briefly, in about three minutes, I will say as a result of the conferences that have been held between the representatives, on the one side, of the three great bodies, the Baptist societies, home mission, foreign mission, and publication, and on the other side, the one organized general conference of Free Baptists, which itself is an incorporated body, there was proposed last March a basis of union or co-operation in mission work, as Dr. Crandall has very fitly called it, and from that basis of union I propose to make a few very brief quotations. And first, for a reason which I need not state, the largest part, probably four-fifths of the printed form in that basis of union, is composed of a historic and documental statement which I shall not attempt to read, but this gives a historic statement as to what divided the people, what had been their history meanwhile, and their present state, and that present state has been expressed very nicely in what a good many of us know to this day as the Brooklyn Declaration, made by the joint committees in the city of Brooklyn three years ago this month. That statement is this:

*Resolved*, that the Baptists and Free Baptists are so closely related by a history which long was common, and has always been kindred,

that they enjoy closer fellowship and a greater similarity in genius and spirit than are common between two Christian bodies. It is recognized as a fact that the original occasion and cause of separation between our two bodies have practically disappeared, and that in all the essentials of Christian doctrine as well as of church administration and polity we are substantially one.

To that was added by the joint committees in Boston last March this statement:

"Differences, if still existing, may be left, where the New Testament leads them, to the teaching of the Scriptures under the guidance of the Holy Spirit," which we all agree to be pretty good authority.

Now, having made that statement we are now voting upon the question of a proposed union in our missionary work upon the following basis:

1. It is recommended that the constitutions of the American Baptist Missionary Union, the American Baptist Home Mission Society, and the American Baptist Publication Society, be so changed as to admit to membership Free Baptists on the same terms as Baptists.

That looks like the Free Baptist going into the Baptist Society.

2. That the general missionary work of the Free Baptists be adopted and carried on by the American Baptist Missionary Union, the American Baptist Home Mission Society, the American Baptist Publication Society, as the missionary agencies of the bodies thus united.

3. That the churches of the united bodies will be expected to contribute to general missions through the above agencies and the representatives of these agencies shall have equal standing in all the churches.

4. That all the missionaries and pastors of the united bodies shall be recognized as on the same footing in all denominational activities.

5. That this union shall go into effect January 1, 1909, provided that previous to that time the Free Baptists shall have approved it and three-fourths of the Baptist state conventions, where there are yearly meetings or associations of Free Baptists, shall have approved it.

6. It is suggested that in states where the Free Baptists equal 25 per cent. of the Baptists, or more, the two organizations be consolidated into one new society to be called "The United Baptist Convention of the State of ———," and as a subtitle "Union of Baptist and Free Baptist Societies."

That is a proposed basis of union between the two bodies, for co-operation in mission work under Baptist auspices. I have already expressed my dissent from the sentiment which would seem to ask us to be called with them the United Baptists. Personally, I hope we shall never have Baptists, Free Baptists, and United Baptists—in other words, not have three names where we should have but one and where we are attempting to reduce the number.

Mr. Chairman, I simply state this: my time is up and I will not attempt to elaborate it further than to say that I believe, with two exceptions, the constituent bodies of our general conference which have acted upon this at all have approved it; and as I stated tonight I believe all the Baptist state conventions but one, which I believe deferred it for a year, have already approved it. I believe, Mr. Chairman, one of the next best steps is to keep stepping forward on the present basis of union between the two with the prayerful hope that something similar shall take in the Disciple brethren if they do not meanwhile decide to take us all in themselves.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: I now have great pleasure in calling upon Dr. Willett, who is minister of this church.

DR. HERBERT L. WILLETT:

*Mr. President, and Members of the Congress:* I am not sure that I can make a contribution to the thought of the evening more concretely or informingly than by speaking a single word with reference to the method by which the union of the two bodies of Disciples and Baptists has been accomplished in the case of Memorial Church.

I want to say to you and I can speak, I am sure, for my colleague, Dr. Van Doren, and for all the members of Memorial Church, that it is a great satisfaction to us to welcome this Congress to this church. It has been a great pleasure to us tonight to have Dr. Crandall upon this platform. Dr. Crandall is most dear to this people. We cannot wish him any of those forms of ill fortune of which he has spoken, but if anything should take him away from Minneapolis we might wish indeed that it would bring him to Chicago and we should welcome him anew with the

greatest possible heartiness into the fellowship of this church. I am not quite sure but that Dr. Van Doren and myself might have grave misgivings if Dr. Crandall should return. Perhaps there would have to be a change in the ministerial order, or perhaps a third minister instead of two. (Laughter.)

That situation which we face today has come upon us in most gradual and wonderful fashion. I do not think that a year ago anybody could possibly have prophesied that we should be today one united church. It came about, as it seems to us, and we cannot but look upon it with a kind of solemn and humble joy, as if it were the movement of the Divine Spirit. We had been thinking of building a new church, those of us who were of the Disciple brotherhood. For that new church we looked about to find a suitable location. The more we thought of the different groups of our own membership, the more this particular location seemed to us the best place. As we came to think over the problem of a definite location, there came to us one day a suggestion from a member of this congregation that we have a union service here, and that the minister of the First Christian Church should preach. The suggestion was rather facetiously given at first, and the answer was, "Why, certainly the minister can preach here and bring his congregation along." And that which was almost laughingly mentioned came to be a matter of serious concern presently, and before we knew it, there had been definite steps taken for the union of the two bodies of people.

It was very interesting to watch that process of union. A group of twelve men was chosen from each of the two churches. These were not churches that were declining; they each had large purposes for the future; one possessed a building, the other did not. It seemed not less than pathetic that two churches so closely united in the great essentials of Christian life should organize two different plants within speaking distance of each other. It seemed to us as if it would be one of the tragedies of latter-day Christianity, and as we met together for conference over the question, we were prepared to consider the differences most likely to interfere with union.

We came, Baptists and Disciples, with lists of those things to which we were prepared to hold with tenacity and with no

possible compromise on either side. When we had faced that list from both sides, we discovered that there were only three things that needed to be discussed, or at the most four; three that were essential from the point of view of doctrine, and one from that of administration. The first was the question of a name. We both agreed we did not wish to adopt a name in which the denominational significance of either of the former bodies should be emphasized. The Disciples said, "We must not have a name in which the word 'Baptist' is used, because that is not a New Testament term." The Baptists said, "We do not wish a name in which the term 'Christian Church' occurs because that is not a New Testament epithet." And the Disciples came with a sudden sense of surprise to discover that this was perfectly true. And so we thought the situation over. Here was a memorial church, a memorial of no individual, but of a great and earnest struggle, of most memorable sacrifice. We thought that a very admirable local name for the church, and all the churches are churches of Christ. Some of us thought that possibly the word Union Church might be wise, but at last we decided upon "Memorial Church of Christ;" that means everything that any of us have in mind, and that was almost instantly approved.

The second point was the question of the admission of members to the church. Our Baptist friends were very insistent, and rightly insistent, I think, upon the fact that they wanted to stand definitely for a regenerated church membership. The Disciples said, "Not less do we. We should not think of anything else than this." But the Baptists said, "Possibly your method of admitting members simply by asking them to confess their faith in Jesus and to be baptized might give the suggestion that there was some indifference to that question of regenerated church membership. Would you be willing to have the question of every member who presents a letter or who presents his confession of faith submitted to the official body of the church? Not to put him under the test of a Christian experience, but to make sure of his motive in coming into the church and his conviction of Christian obligation?" The Disciples said they would be very glad to do that. That precisely voices our own conception of the legiti-

macy and the necessity for close inquiry with reference to the motives and purposes of all who enter the church.

The third point concerned the communion service; the Disciples said, "We should like to have a weekly communion service. We have been accustomed to celebrate the Lord's Supper every Lord's Day." One after another of the Baptists, I think to the number of three in the group of twelve, arose and said, "We come from Baptist churches that celebrate the Lord's Supper every week. There is no question, so far as we are concerned, upon that point." It is not an obligatory matter; it never has been among the Disciples. Therefore upon that question, all agreed without dissent.

The fourth point concerned the administration of the church, especially as to the missionary offerings. What kind of a church is this to be? Is it to be a Baptist church? Is it to be a Disciple church? What is to be its order and life? We said from the very start, "This church is not to be a separate institution. We do not propose under any circumstances to make here the beginning of a third denomination. What we propose is that this church shall be absolutely in line with all the great missionary and philanthropic interests of both these peoples." This church, therefore, stands always and everywhere for the great Baptist interests; its missionary associations, its philanthropic enterprises, its benevolences of all kinds. These are a part of the budget and the purpose of this church. Equally do we stand by those great enterprises that belong to the Disciples of Christ. In all things that concern the larger work of these two bodies of people, this church is in perfect accord with them, and we have found it a very comforting thing to observe how easily adjustable that matter is. This church finds itself, therefore, not divorced from either of these brotherhoods, only possessed of a new set of associations. We are all of us here in this church in closest relationship with a great brotherhood on this side or that, which we did not know before, whose interests have become suddenly ours. In this experiment, only a few months old as yet, and still moving on with great simplicity and beauty, frictionless in its operation thus far, and bidding fair to settle itself into ever more admirable working order, in this experiment we have no desire to pose as an example



to others. None the less, we do have a very deep and earnest wish that this might be a contribution to that unity of the people of God, between at least these two great bodies, and that what we have tried to do here, and are doing, might become in some manner exemplary in those communities where it is possible, upon such simple and obvious terms as we have here adopted, to take up the task of uniting these two bodies of Christians which ought so much to be one.

**PRESIDENT JACKSON:** There is no one who can better represent the great Baptist brotherhood than Dr. A. G. Lawson who will be the next speaker.

**DR. ALBERT G. LAWSON (New York City):**

*Mr. President:* It hardly seems gracious to say that I did not write my own name, and yet I am only too glad to speak tonight a few moments upon this question. I have a peculiar kind of fitting in urging Christian unity. My mother was trained in the Episcopal church, my father in the Reformed Dutch church, while I went to the Methodist Sunday school in the morning and to the Presbyterian in the afternoon. (Laughter.) I am now a member of the Memorial Church of Christ of New York City, of which Dr. Edward Judson is pastor. It does not use the word "Baptist" and has its communion service every Lord's Day.

Some years ago in New York, when our Episcopalian friends were discussing the question of high church and low church, a bright young rector having charge of their Seaman's Bethel work said nothing until he was called up, and then he said, "With me it is entirely a matter of tide: when it is high tide, I am high church; when it is low tide, I am low church." (Laughter.)

Now, if by the grace of God we get into our hearts a recognition of the genuine meaning of what is called the infilling of the spirit of God, with the desires, with the hopes, with the convictions that many of us cherish tonight, the tide will come steadily up and up and up, until the waters rise over obstructions that may seem tonight most formidable, and they will be put out of the way.

There are difficulties, and we cannot quite do as a Scotch minister who, commenting on a certain passage, said, "Brethren,

the passage is full of difficulties. We will boldly face the difficulties and pass on." (Laughter.) We must meet them frankly and try to get them out of the way. The brethren who have read tonight are right; we cannot afford to make believe that there are no hindrances, no difficulties, no misapprehensions. There are cantankerous men on both sides, and we must discount all this in advance. We need a clear vision in recognition of the fact that our Lord is leading in the direction of unity, and a clear recognition of the fact that we as his followers need a deeper passion for him in his leadership for the things which are choice to him. With the vision and the passion as clearly and as steadily as is possible for honest men who have conviction, we must move in the direction the vision and the passion inspire us to go. We are so near together that for us, more than for other bodies who talk about union, it is a sad shame, in the presence of a heathen world, that we should not be one. We are so alike in our clear consciousness that there is nothing in heaven or on earth that has a right to stand between the intelligent soul and the wonderful God who gave Jesus Christ for the redemption of that soul. We are so clearly at one upon those things that are most vital and most clearly apprehended by our people, it is indeed sad that we should so long have kept apart. We can afford to say as to the Free Baptist position, that we, who call ourselves Baptists, have come to the place where Benjamin Randall stood. With open eyes and warm hearts, with earnest and honest convictions, we are standing there today, and we thank God for it.

Let us recognize, and hesitate not to say it freely and clearly, the things about which we are agreed are more and more important than those about which we differ. Now, because we love him, let us face toward that which we know to be right and move as intelligently and as promptly as possible to emphasize our unity in Christ.

Dr. Crandall has shown us the action of our brethren in Minnesota. May every one of our state conventions take like action.

Brethren, the millions of the heathen, if figures can be trusted, are increasing, not decreasing. The overmastering power of sectarianism, as manifested in this country by two great denominations, is increasing, not decreasing. There has been no generation

when it seemed so absolutely necessary that those who see clearly their God, and who so tenaciously hold themselves as accountable only to God, should clasp hands together in missionary work on the foreign field, on the home field, in the state, and in the city in every way possible, and in every kind of opportunity possible, to seek each the other's good and rejoice whenever there may be such a blessed fellowship as has been secured and revealed before us in these two churches tonight.

May I live long enough to see the fulfilling of all this in our own land, and, whatever the name may be—I am not concerned about names, but I am concerned that God shall keep us in the unity of the Spirit with His Son. Having the Spirit of Christ we may be assured that we are his and that he will keep us.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We will now hear from Dr. Henry M. Ford, D.D., corresponding secretary of the General Conference of Free Baptists.

DR. HENRY M. FORD:

I am as surprised and delighted as you are over the fraternal spirit and brotherly feeling in this meeting. It amounts to almost a revelation. I supposed that Free Baptists were ahead in liberality and fraternity and brotherhood, but I did not know that the Free Baptists will have to give the palm to the Disciples and Baptists.

I am reminded of the story of the Englishman that went out hunting foxes and the dogs scared up a fox, and they disappeared over the hill. The Englishman lumbered on after them and finally came upon a countryman to whom he said, "Did you see a fox and a dog going along here?" "Yes, I did," was the reply. "Well, how did it go?" "Well, it was about neck and neck but I guess the dog was a little ahead." (Laughter.) I do not know but the Disciples and the Baptists are a little ahead in this spirit of liberality and union.

But the Free Baptists have voted on this basis of union and we have the requisite votes and now we are waiting to hear the Bridegroom's voice. We hope our Baptist brethren will not do like the young man I heard of not long since—I do not believe they will—who asked his girl to have him and she said, "Yes." "Well," he

said, "I will look around and if I do not see anybody I like any better I will let you know." (Laughter.) We do not believe our Baptist brethren will do that. We are as Free Baptists in the attitude of the little Scotch maid. Abraham met her one morning and said, "Betsy, the Lord has revealed it unto me that it is his will that I should marry thee." And she meekly folded her hands and said, "Abraham, the will of the Lord be done." (Laughter.)

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We will now listen to Dr. J. H. Garrison, editor of the *Christian Evangelist*, St. Louis.

DR. J. H. GARRISON:

*Mr. President:* I must say with some of the other brethren that I have been drafted and have not volunteered for this service, pleasant and delightful as it is. I may say, however, that I feel quite at home in an assembly of this kind, an assembly of Baptists, Free Baptists, and Disciples. The fact is, I got my start as a Baptist. I was, in my boyhood days, a loyal member of the Baptist church, and my father and mother, and, as far as I know, the generations back, were of that faith, so that you see I am feeling quite at home tonight in the company of Baptists.

I might say, with Paul, "When I was a child, I spake as a child," and so forth. (Laughter.)

I was struck with the quotation which one of the brethren made from Dr. Shakespeare of England, and I wondered if he was in any way related to the poet Shakspeare, and drew from his imagination. If I had not been a resident of England myself, and a pastor of a church for two years in that country, I might have thought that he had done so; but I fear there is some ground for the remark which he made. You will understand that, when I tell you that I myself, loyal Disciple as I am, was not permitted to sit at the Communion Table with these brethren that called themselves by the same name, in England, and I suppose it must be those brethren to whom he refers whose extreme exclusiveness might cause them to be misunderstood upon that subject. There is an ocean between us, and they have gotten very far away from the teaching of the great body of their brethren in this country.

I would like to say, in this connection, that I indorse Brother

Spencer's address from beginning to end. I have been forty years—young a man as I am—editing a paper among the Disciples of Christ and I think I know the sentiment of the people. That is a representative statement of our position which he has given you.

One of the brethren made a very wise remark tonight when he said that we should not take too seriously statements of individuals; and that is especially true, brethren, if we go back to the period of religious debates, for you know we used to do a good deal of that. If you go back to the literature of those days, when we used to discuss questions as this: "The church to which I, John Brown, belong, is a true church of Jesus Christ." A Baptist would affirm that of himself, and a Disciple would affirm that the church to which he belonged was a church of Christ, and each of them would deny that the church to which the other belonged was a church of Christ! Now, if you go back to that period and read our literature you will find very extreme statements in the newspapers of both religious bodies. I suggest that we ought to come down to this side of the War period, therefore, when we begin to quote from each other as authority for each other's position.

Now, brethren, on this subject of union, I cannot tell you how deeply I feel. It has been a hobby of mine for a long, long while. I have told you that I was a member of the Baptists. Do you know what won me to my present position? It was the simple plea for the union of God's people upon the broad basis of simple New Testament Christianity in order that we might make a united opposition to the evil forces of the world. That is what won me—the plea for union—and now, when I come into a meeting like this and see that the spirit of union is among all the people, and when I go to a meeting like that which I attended in New York City, three years ago, and find that the spirit of union is dominating all our Protestantism today, I thank God that I have lived through these years to see this better day.

I have no sort of doubt at all, though Brother Crandall and I may not live to see the time, that this union shall be consummated. Brethren, it is coming, just as sure as you and I are here tonight, it is coming. It cannot be otherwise. It is going to take place under the law of spiritual gravitation; "And I, if I be lifted up,

will draw all men to me." Is not Jesus Christ drawing us all nearer to him, and is it possible for us to get nearer to him, without getting nearer to each other?

The fact is, I have said for years, concerning Baptists and Disciples, that there is no way for progress in either religious body except through approximation to each other. Every other line of progress is shut off. To go forward along right lines is to come nearer to each other and into closer fellowship with each other. The very law of our growth then means growing unity. It cannot be otherwise. It is a law of God in his universe. There are two forces that are making for unity; the one internal and the other external: The internal, as I have said, is that law of affinity and growth toward Jesus Christ, growing more like him and more like each other as the days go by.

Now, that process is one that we cannot control. As long as we cultivate our religious life, and grow in grace and the knowledge of the truth, that process will go on and we shall go along converging lines until we shall feel our elbows touch in our march to the City of God.

The other force is the great need of the world. Oh, the greatness of that pressure! Who has ever caught a vision of the abominations of heathenism; who has ever borne upon his heart the burden of sorrow and agony of the heathen world; who has ever looked upon it, seen it, and felt it, and then has turned to our own country and seen the evils that are intrenched in our own civilization and has not felt the imperative need for a united church to confront these united forces of evil? I believe, therefore, that under the operation of these two mighty forces Jesus Christ is drawing us together in Him, and we who are here tonight, many of us, I believe, shall live to see these three bodies marching forward to the sweet music of the church to bring in the universal reign of Jesus Christ.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: One more short address and we will be dismissed. The next speaker hails from Boston. We must know what Boston says before we can do anything else. Let us hear from Rev. J. Stanley Durkee, who is a Free Baptist.

REV. J. STANLEY DURKEE, PH.D., Boston:

*Mr. President:* Standing before a great audience of ministers and laymen a few days ago in Massachusetts, a gentleman who wished to defer the matter of union said, "Why, Free Baptist stands for the sovereignty of the human will. We cannot unite with them." The marvelous upheaval of the gray matter that produced that sentence!

Dr. Crandall is rather crowing over Minnesota. You know the country was saved over there where there is a granite shaft going up into the heavens marking the spot that we love to call Bunker Hill. Massachusetts has been leading Minnesota; I did not dare to stand up when he called for volunteers. Let me tell you how: First, let me say that the Baptist and Free Baptist state conferences in New England and throughout the West have voted so far that Baptists and Free Baptists tonight can say the union is assured on the basis laid down; and on January 1, 1909, the two denominations move on to the one platform of union for missionary work, both foreign and home work. And the last of those declarations shall be fulfilled in states where Free Baptists represent 25 per cent. of the Baptists. It shall be a union with another name. We are glad that in very few states that is accomplished. I am a Baptist and I do not want another name or another adjective added on, either before or after.

Three weeks ago the Massachusetts Free Baptist Association voted that a committee consisting of thirty-six be appointed to meet a similar committee of thirty-six appointed by the Baptists of that state to bring about the union of the two doctrines in 1909. The Baptists, two weeks ago, by a tremendous cheer, followed by the old song, "Blessed Be the Tie that Binds," carried it on their side; and tonight over in Boston, next to that graveyard that Professor Matthews spoke about, that literary graveyard, they are just simply waiting for the appointment of the committees and 1909 to come, to bring about that last union.

Massachusetts reaches her hands, not across the seas, but over the lakes, not over the ferry at Detroit, but through the new tunnel, to shake hands with Minnesota on the great union of our two denominations.

I have always been interested in the strange development of

people. We were driven apart by an overdose of Calvinism and an overdose of Arminianism. The Baptists said, "We do not believe that everybody is called of God or that God loves everybody," but they acted just as if they did believe it; and they have grown to represent five millions in this country. The Free Baptists said, "We do believe that God loves everybody and calls everybody, and every man must decide for himself," but they acted as if they did not believe it. And they have been a small denomination, but they have been the yeast in the meal, and the whole is leavened, as Dr. Lawson has so sweetly and wonderfully told you out of his heart.

Now, the day is here, and 1909 is very close. Free Baptists and Baptists stand on the threshold of union. Jesus prayed for it. Doctrinal unitizing is invited, business sagacity demands it, lonely pastors on lonely fields implore it, and prophecy has a voice in this matter which says, "Now is the accepted time. Behold now is the day of consolidation."

PRESIDENT JACKSON: This will close our very interesting session. I will ask Dr. Lawson to close the convention in prayer.

Dr. Albert G. Lawson offered the closing prayer and the Congress adjourned to reconvene at 10 o'clock A. M., Thursday, November 12, 1908.



### THIRD DAY

#### *Morning Session*

November 12, 1908

10:00 o'clock A. M.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: The hour has arrived for the beginning of this morning session. We will be led in prayer by Brother Curry of Omaha.

REV. E. R. CURRY, of Omaha, offered the opening prayer.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We will now proceed immediately to the discussion of the theme before us this morning, which is: "Is Psycho-Therapeutics a Function of the Church?" The first writer is Robert MacDonald, of Brooklyn.

REV. ROBERT MACDONALD, D.D. (Baptist), read the following paper:

#### IS PSYCHO-THERAPEUTICS A FUNCTION OF THE CHURCH?

The church evidently thinks so, if widespread interest among the churches can be taken as an indication. It is safe to say that more series of sermons are being preached just now upon psycho-therapeutics than upon any other adaptation of the Gospel as solvent for the world's ills. Reports have come from one source and another of such declarations from many states, in fact as far west as Oregon and California, and as far south as Florida and Texas, while in many New England cities and towns appreciative sermons have been preached or are announced for the coming winter. In Boston and vicinity, for instance, according to a periodical that has surveyed the field, a full two dozen churches, including Episcopalian, Congregational, Baptist, Unitarian, and Universalist, are promised Sabbath or week-night discussions of psycho-therapeutics.

Then quite a little personal work is being done in the application of these remedial principles. One of the older and most con-

servative of our ministers writes of remarkable results in treating a woman who had not swallowed solid food for fourteen years. His full word is, "There is great reason for religious rejoicing in these new discoveries and their implications. I find inspiration, health, and joy in the whole thing as it appears to me. Of course it changes nothing theological or, at least, I so think, but it enriches experience wonderfully." Another clergyman, possibly the most prominent in the denomination, writes that he rejoices in this coming-in of scientific Christianity, and that he has for a year or more privately held a clinic in his church study an hour a day for all who chose to come. One of the younger clergy said a few weeks ago: "I have preached these principles and offered to apply them to whoever felt the need of such remedy. And would you believe that in four weeks I have got into closer touch with my people than during the entire four years of my pastorate."

I have now coming to my home a young clergyman, of another denomination and another city, to be freed of an evil habit, because he said, "I have the conviction that my Christian influence will be immensely increased in putting these principles into my church, but I want them first put into me—I want to be benefited that I may benefit others."

Psycho-therapeutics increase ministerial efficiency in opening the way to a congregation's confidence, as no other application of the gospel can. A friendly critic, when recently told that each person treated was prayed with, and that suggestions of Christian truth were offered, said: "Why, then, the new name, Emmanuel Movement? Why not the old gospel of Christ, for that is what it is." My answer was, "The new name advertises the old cure." It surely does, in enabling the minister to get at the people. How unsatisfactory is much of our pastoral visitation, to ourselves at least, and at times doubtless to our people, just because we seldom gain their confidence. They will not disclose their ills, bad habits, shortcomings, because the minister does not represent to them positive, practical, remedial helpfulness. But let it be known he has a remedy for their ills and can relieve their worries, nervousness, bad habits, and they cease to talk of the weather, the fashions, their neighbors, and their

busy social, domestic, or mercantile life, and are communicative of their ills instead. The meaningless term "pastor" becomes meaningful to them. They see him as a confidant, a father confessor, a friend.

It even presents a welcome substitute for so-called pastoral visitation. Instead of the minister going the rounds of perfunctory calling, often finding his parishoners not in, or engaged in other things, and if visible, in no frame of mind to talk upon the deep things of life, the parishoner now calls on him if there be a crying need to be satisfied. All ministers know how vast the difference between seeking a person and striving for an opening to get at his difficulty, and the being sought for by that person that religious aid be had. We all know the value of a heart to heart talk with one who can enter into our grief sympathetically. It relaxes and rests us. The old restrictions become unloosed. We experience ease and a sense of freedom. And if the person to whom we confide the secret of our discontent has the ability to help us out of our misery, our very confidence in him has curative force.

But will the people come? Yes! They will, and if you are known as one who through this new "God with us" remedy can be consulted on all possible troubles, people will come in greater numbers than you can take care of. They will come though they never saw you before, and even though they have pastors of their own. But frequently the request is, "Do not tell my minister about this. I would not have him know for the world that I have this trouble or that I came to see you." "Why not?" "Because he, having no remedy to offer, does not invite my confidence and therefore cannot share my secret."

I had most significant evidence of this recently. A gentleman of the legal profession asked for a conference. He came at the appointed time, and for two hours poured out his heart to a stranger, revealing that he was a Sunday-school teacher and a church officer. He told me of domestic trouble, of business worries, of nervousness, and of sleeplessness. But he also said, "I could not tell this to my own minister, for though a learned man he is cold and cynical and unsympathetic." I found he was seriously contemplating Christian Science because his friends

in that faith had a buoyancy of spirit, a joy of heart and of face that he had not. "I am worried," he explained, "and distracted and sick, and while it would be terrible to leave the old church I will be forced to unless I can get help." He never would have come those thirty miles into a strange city and given his confidence to a strange man had he read of that man being a gospel preacher, however eloquent. What brought him was the report that over in Brooklyn was a minister who could dispel his despondency and cure his miserable, dyspeptic, sleepless condition.

Hear the case of an inebriate that illustrates the same idea. Five conferences changed him from a shambling-gaited, blear-eyed, devil-haunted wretch into a strong man. In ten days he was changed from a living disgrace to his church and his Christian profession to an honor to his church, his Lord, and his own humanity. He has been restored to his church, attends the services each Sabbath morning, and on Sabbath evenings the church of the man who put him on his feet.

Scores of similar remedies in behalf of all conceivable ailments and bad habits could be mentioned, no one of which would have sought out church or minister because he could give them the simple gospel of the Son of God, but for the practical curative ability the church and ministry embodied to their thought.

If psycho-therapeutics is not a legitimate church function, it ought to be made so, and that quickly, to enable the minister to become more effective and indispensable, the sick soul more useful, and the church more attractive and helpful.

Such is the immediate gain, all along the line, to the minister, to the troubled soul, to the church, which is made in reality what it was intended by its apostolic founders to be, namely, the world's most humanitarian institution.

The beneficial influence upon the minister cannot well be estimated. It imparts a knowledge of men to which he was before a stranger, and it gives him a *hold* upon himself and the community amazing to contemplate. In short, no other mental or religious exercise can, in so brief a time, impart so liberal an education.

A further reason for it to be made a function of the church is because it makes for the reintroduction of the mystical element

into religion. A momentous little book has recently been published by Dr. Newman Smyth entitled, *The Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism*, in which, among other weighty causes given to explain the decadence of the church, are these: That the contact is broken between the current of thought in the church and the general mental activity of the day. Also that much religion is withdrawing from the churches. Upon this latter point his sad confession is:

In almost any community there may be found considerable numbers of people who are not in their habit of mind irreligious, nor without faith in their hearts, but they belong to no church, confess no creed and rarely attend public worship. There is a kind of religious literature, not generally known among our church membership, seldom recognized by theologians, but to be found in the book stores and having large sales, a literature that is somewhat mystical, quietistic, and spiritual, but neither churchly nor very distinctively Christian. The spread of this kind of literature outside the church is a noteworthy phenomena. The older mysticism, the former quietism flourished within the church. Now it springs up outside the churches and beyond their creeds.

Now what do we mean by that mysticism that used to flourish inside the church and which we desire to see recognized by the church as being a legitimate factor in religion? Well, it takes us back to the years between the fifth and eleventh centuries when mysticism reigned supreme. The mystic strove to know God directly through contemplation. He saw the fulness of life to be in God, therefore the fruition of all ecstatic experience to be in suffusing the soul with contemplation of God. He brought the object of worship into the present, and conceived of religion as a life rather than a dogma. Scholasticism, which had its use in the eleventh century, saw religion to be a dogma, not a life. The scholastic tried to demonstrate God's existence. The mystic sought to know God. The immediacy of religious experience, the filling of the soul with the presence of God was his endeavor. Schleiermacher, at the beginning of the last century, whom Zeller, the historian of Greek philosophy, called the greatest theologian of the Protestant church since the Reformation, was the great mystic, due to his early Moravian training. To him religion was a feeling—the feeling of absolute dependence on

God. It fused and tempered all his scholasticism, inherited in terms of vigorism from Immanuel Kant, in terms of romanticism from Goethe, in terms of aestheticism from Schlegel and Schiller, and made him the greatest court preacher in Europe. It tempered his scholasticism, I say, as did mysticism temper the scholasticism of the years between the twelfth and sixteenth centuries. But the trouble with the ancient mysticism, as with the modern as embodied in the Christian Science, New Thought, and faith-cure movements, was that it was too purely ascetic. Having a higher and more immediate means of access to God than through knowledge, scholarship, and institution, it made intellectual and institutional approach unnecessary. Thus it never concerned itself with a philosophic basis for its belief. It constructed no system of doctrine. It was indifferent to civic responsibility and the duties of social life. It, in the olden days, meant complete intellectual stagnation. No wonder scholasticism came in as a correction of mysticism. Today we have the same dilemma to confront. Christian Science has, however, builded an institution, its only ecclesiastical achievement. New Thought, numbering over one and a half million disciples in the United States, seven-eighths of whom were formerly communicants of the conservative evangelical denominations, is ascetic through and through. Its advocates are each year withdrawing in large numbers from Christian church to become mystics. They have wearied of ecclesiasticism, dogmatism, formal and often mechanical modes of worship, but alas, also of missions, of extended charities, of relations of brotherhood, of necessary organization for the perpetuation of the religious institution. All are thrown over for a quietistic, meditative, aspirational approach to God, satisfying spiritual hunger, inspiring and warming the intellectual life, and to some extent remedying bodily ills.

Now if psycho-therapeutics is not a church function, it is high time it was so, for its religious side is as necessary to its efficiency in reconstructing life as is its mental. Henry Drummond once said, "No reconciliation is needed between evolution and Christianity, as they are the two sides of the same cosmic reality, having the same author, the same end, the same spirit." So of psychology and Christianity. They are by nature related, inas-

much as both have to do with the physic side of life. The tendency today is toward the reinvesting of the individual with greater significance than he was ever before conscious of meriting. We have passed through the biological stage of adjustment with no inconsiderable gain to all concerned. We have thrashed over the sociological problem with its egoistic and altruistic extremes and with large advantage to the other man in the network of social relationships. The coming decade will witness the complete swinging of the life pendulum, from the biological upward, and from the sociological inward, toward the individual, toward his divine possibilities of power and his imperial rights as a child of God. The scientific medium of this consideration will be psychology. It is already occupying the field with the world's eyes riveted upon its investigations and findings. Its companion in the research will be Christianity. They are by nature related as both have to do with the psychic side of life. Revelation will furnish the rich content to the psychologic form. Psychology uncovers the potential depths of being in the human sphere. Christianity imparts to those depths infinite meaning. Psychology reveals the mental forces that shall be instrumental in the reconstruction of the life personal. Christianity shows those forces to be of divine origin. Psychology discovers the limitless subconscious human capacity. Christianity draws the curtain still farther aside and reveals that realm of the individual limitless to be the finite manifestation of the universal life that is creative and remedial unto all the universe, including man. Psychology, because interested in all psychic conditions, asks for evidence of personal immortality the other side of death. Christianity has for near two thousand years had acquaintance with the unseen world and waits to lay its evidence before every inquiring mind and bring its assurances of the divine friendliness to every lonely troubled heart.

But only now is the church awaking to the remedial power within its reach. Under what has become known as the Emmanuel Movement the remedial work goes on. It is a distinctively practical movement for the curing of our ills. Here for the first time psychology and Christianity openly join hands and demonstrate their willingness to work together in a God-inten-

tioned unit. For the first time physician and priest combine in psycho-therapeutics against the ravages of disease.

In close connection with this emphasis upon the mystical side of religion reintroduced into the church is the demand that the church give practical, tangible help to the entire life of man as did Jesus of Nazareth in the old Galilean days. Dr. Worchester exclaims:

A large and ever increasing number of intelligent people feel that the church has outgrown or is outgrowing her usefulness, because the church is no longer indispensable to men. Unquestionably one of the great motives of all human belief is the practical motive, believing because it is good and useful to believe. The good religion has done the world and is still doing is one of the chief reasons man believes in religion, and the more good any particular religion or church is able to do the more men will believe in it, and the less visible good the church does, the less men will believe in it!

This practical, remedial measure, so richly operative when Jesus walked the earth, is the lost something we are trying to reclaim, that Christianity may be a more highly prized factor in life. That lost something is that Christianity has a redeeming power for the cure of the body as truly as for the cure of the soul. Preparation for living as a disembodied spirit the other side of the grave is a weak, vague appeal to a man who cares only for living on this side. The proclamation of cure for a spiritual nature he is not conscious of possessing is wasted energy compared with the cure of a body whose maladies hold him in painful bondage every hour of the day—the body looks so much bigger and more important to the majority of mortals than does the spirit that spiritual appeal falls often on deaf ears. The church must present a motive as compelling as does the world with its appeals of pleasure and sense gratification. Its opportunity is in the assurance of health, present, temperate, physical health. That strikes hard; it awakens his interest and his response. Yes, but he must become whole in spirit first. Well, he will pay the price and submit to the spiritual treatment if it bear practical tangible fruitage in the achieving of health.

That is how the church meets the demand of the hour, in



possessing a more substantial content and meaning for the man of the world.

It is surprising how much the New Testament says about the cure of the body. Christ puts it in the very forefront of his ministry, giving it such prominence that, did we not know better, we might infer it was his chief concern. In only one or two cases of hundreds examined in the Gospel of St. Matthew does our Lord forgive sins first. When he sends out his twelve disciples his charge to them reads thus: "He gave them power over unclean spirits to cast them out, to heal all manner of sickness, and all manner of diseases." And when he bids them preach that the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand he continues: "Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils." When John sent his messengers to determine if he were the Messiah, he answers: "Tell John what I see and hear. The blind receive their sight, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the poor have the gospel preached to them." He thus puts the healing of the body in the very forefront of his ministry and he bids his disciples put it in the very forefront of theirs, making it their first concern. He, moreover, shows such anxiety to banish disease that he pauses not to require faith on the sufferer's part. Nor does he seem to transmit his curative power through a healthy mind to a cleansed soul. In many cases there is no telling how many he heals involuntarily. In the case of the diseased women the hem of his garment is touched. On another occasion we read, "they brought all that were diseased that they might touch the hem of his garment and as many as touched were made whole."

We must not, however, conclude that the health of the body was Christ's supreme concern, nor must it for an instant be the church's chief care. It must be made incidental—a single feature in a score of other, all important, concerns. While the church should emphasize the influence of religions upon health, it should exercise extreme caution and great moderation lest religion degenerate into a health cult, and the church become an infirmary for nerve-sick bodies instead of a sanitarium for sin-sick souls. Never forget that the supreme object of piety is of infinitely greater importance than to cure physical ailments. The probe of Christianity must go deeper than the flesh. To be physically

well is not necessarily to be righteous. Christianity has a vastly more important contract on its hands than the cure of pains and aches. All therapeutic work must be introductory to a complete emancipation of personality from sin unto the full stature of that divine manhood embodied in Jesus Christ. Its ambition must be nothing more radical than the opening-up to the church of an additional field of usefulness, to bridge what Dr. Jefferson, of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York, calls the world-wide phenomena of an ever-deepening estrangement between the church and large classes of our population, and to help make what Dr. Parkhurst, of the Madison Square Presbyterian Church, calls the need for the church to make men comfortable, decent, righteous citizens of the world that now is, instead of continuing to be excessively addicted to the work of preparing them to live in heaven. The step, he exclaims, that is obligatory upon the church is to enter more appreciatively and sympathetically into the material, intellectual, and spiritual necessities of the people in this present life. We may depend upon it, he continues, that people will love the church as much as the church loves the people.

A last reason for psycho-therapeutics to be considered a church function is that in dealing with the subconscious mind we are dealing with the soul, and if it is not the church's function to deal with man's soul, it ought to be.

This is undoubtedly the great discovery science has given the world without knowing or conceding it. The term subconscious mind, we must remember, is a psychological definition of everything that is attributable to the soul. It is the residential realm below the threshold of consciousness, full of limitless power, so that Dr. Schofield, of the British Medical Association, exclaimed that doubtless it has limits but they have never been discovered. The psychologist tells us that this subconscious mind is not friendly to inductive processes, that it never investigates nor scrutinizes nor reasons, but is always susceptible to deductive processes following a clue, taking a hint or suggestion that an inferior or superior intelligence forces upon it for its self-assertion; then working logically, unerringly, and often swiftly toward the desired end. The psychologist further tells us that it has con-

trol of every involuntary function and organ of the body. Thus it makes or breaks a life in proportion as good influences or bad are brought to bear upon it; for they all take root there and grow, producing permanent conditions in keeping with those commands and inducements.

Is not this why it has such limitless power? It is the individual manifestation of the universal, the God-mind that is omnipotent and omnipresent. That soul-nature would also share in the divine omniscience did not a finite intelligence interfere, inducing the soul or subconscious mind, which cannot guide itself, to become the prey of poor advice, wrong suggestion, superstition, selfish precept, sinful influences. But if evil habit, or diseased, obsessed personality is there, it is necessary to thrust aside the person's finite intelligence and intrude a superior intelligence that has a helpful remedial suggestion to offer for the soul's guidance.

The world's troubled ones see psycho-therapeutics to be a churchly function inasmuch as they are never weary of searching out the minister of Christ to unburden their hearts, and ask of him, as of no other man in existence, a remedy for their ills.

What rich content, then, has the psychologist unwittingly revealed as belonging to the soul; what startling therapeutic power to reconstruct the manifold functional working of the life over which it has control, and what possibilities of enrichment it can realize unto the life plastic enough to receive its rich truths! But who so well equipped as the minister of Christ to assume the precious responsibility of wielding the truth, that will make over the life that appeals for help?

In conclusion, then, remember two things: First, that the diseases remedied by the Emmanuel Movement are diseases of personality. They may be fitly designated as psychic ailments. See if it be not so. There is hysteria which manifests itself in exaggerated emotional displays, such as intense craving of sympathy or admiration, or in unconscious simulation of various diseases, the fruit of an ill-balanced though by no means organically diseased brain; hypochondria, or the fixed but groundless belief that a person is suffering from some particular disease; neurasthenia, which covers a vast variety of nerve weaknesses, from mild depression to extreme prostration, which cases a prom-

inent nerve specialist states numbered 50,000 a generation ago, but have increased to 250,000, although a prominent physician recently told me that every man and woman in the United States was a neurasthenic—had some form of nerve weakness. Then there is psychasthenia in which the person has a sense of incompleteness, or strangeness of things in general, and is the subject of abnormal fears and all kinds of impracticalities. Then there are alcoholism, morphinism, cocainism, which end in intellectual and moral degeneration and insomnia, one of the most terrible curses of modern life, and religious mania and melancholia in which the sufferer imagines himself to have committed the unpardonable sin and that God has abandoned him; fits of anger, of hate, of groundless suspicion, which the person is powerless to conquer; and finally, suicidal impulses, springing sometimes from deep depression, utter despair, or a sense of shame and disgust. Of course you recognize every one of these ailments to be diseases of personality, resulting from such causes as breakdown of religious faith, the growing artificiality of our social system; the mad rush for wealth; mental idleness and frivolity; the use of stimulants and narcotics, lack of self-control from overwork, or culpable self-indulgence, producing a neurotic or disordered system.

Now who will say it is not a function of the church to look after and redeem human personalities—and if the church have a nobler function, pray tell me what that function is. That is our first concluding thought. Our second is that the curative suggestion in the hands of a Christian minister can be filled full of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Whosoever objects to the introduction of psychology into the church, let me say to him that we are introducing only psychologic terms. Subconscious mind, suggestion, psycho-therapeutics mean nothing more alarming than the soul, good advice, health of spirit. And what does the church stand for if not to represent the soul and to embody good advice, and to conserve the health of the spirit? It is simply using modern terms of true scientific character to help the modern man, but to help him with very ancient truth, truth as old as eternity. It is, in its last analysis, that splendid Pauline attempt

of becoming all to all men that we may win some who might otherwise be lost.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: The next writer on this theme is Rev. J. Stanley Durkee, of Boston.

REV. J. STANLEY DURKEE, PH.D. (Free Baptist), Boston, Mass., submitted the following paper:

### IS PSYCHO-THERAPY A FUNCTION OF THE CHURCH?

The ministry of Jesus Christ was divided between the sick and the well. His gospel was the same for both, but differently administered. To the well, he spoke as a well, strong man. The legends of the Bedouin tribes in Palestine picture him as the noblest of noble men physically, with sandy hair, large blue eyes, and a striking, commanding appearance.

We draw our conception of his weakness and emaciation from Isa., chap. 53, where we so wrongly interpret those words, "When we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him." The prophet had in mind the first-born son, the athletic pugilist of great muscle, powerful frame, and swaggering pride. Among the Bedouins even of today, such a one is called "the beauty." Goliath is a prominent example of "the beauty" in Old Testament history, as well as Saul, afterward king of Israel.

When Isaiah wrote "there is no beauty that we should desire him," he meant simply to say, "He shall not win by sheer muscle or brute force; he shall win by gentler, more potent methods." The reference is not to the great Servant's personal presence, save to declare that he would not be the prince of pugilists.

We never read of Jesus Christ being sick. He is reported to have been weary, exhausted, hungry, thirsty, sleepy, but never sick. The gospels teem with touches of awe that his very physical presence produced. He was well and strong! He spoke to the well and strong. He called strong, rugged, sea-stained fishermen to follow him. They came. They gladly followed. Wherever his strength has been revealed it has always attracted strength. Had it not been for the mistaken reading of Isaiah and the mood of those artists who have painted his face in such distress, he

would long ago have become our standard of physical development, as he is our standard of character. Hofmann's face of the boy Christ among the doctors, is, to my mind, the only true conception of his strength and beauty. Give that face twenty years of the life Jesus led, and the result would be a God-like form and face worthy the God-like character he lived.

As the strong, perfect man, he also ministered to the sick. He healed their diseases, and their gratitude opened their hearts to hear his words and to believe. I have often wondered how many of those five hundred brethren to whom Christ appeared after his resurrection were followers he had won to himself by first healing their sickness. The gratitude of those restored to health by a physician is one of the deep sources of joy to the physician, especially if he does not attempt to collect his fees.

It will be very instructive to glance at the commission Christ gave the Seventy as he sent them out two by two through Palestine, preparing the way for his coming. Matthew tells us the command was, "Go preach, saying, The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand. Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out demons." All further instructions related to their personal conduct (Matt. 10:5-15). *Mark* tells us that Jesus sent them forth, and that "he gave them power over unclean spirits, . . . and they went out, and preached that men should repent. And they cast out many demons, and anointed with oil many that were sick and healed them" (Mark 6:7-13). *Luke* writes the Master's words thus, "heal the sick . . . and say unto them, the Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you" (Luke 10:1-11). We notice that in every report the command is, "heal the sick."

When we turn to the new church at work, as recorded in the Book of Acts, preaching the word and healing the sick are still *the* Christian duties. In chap. 2 we read of the baptism by fire, followed by Peter's great sermon and the conversion of three thousand souls. Chap. 3 opens with an account of Peter's healing ministry. All through those years the ministry of preaching and healing went side by side.

The apostle James gives us very clear instructions. "Is any among you sick? Let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of

the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick, and the Lord shall raise him up" (James 5:14).

Jesus ministered to the sick, and then sent his followers out with the command to do as he had done. When was the command abrogated? When did he say to his followers, "Cease your ministries to the sick and confine them to the well"? Gradually, as the medical fraternity advanced, the healing ministries of the church receded, until it came about that the church let go all healing ministry and the medical fraternity took all—that is, all it could. It has never taken all. It never can take all. There are cases of sickness that only those who know Jesus Christ face to face can heal. When the complete separation between medicine and ministry had taken place, then up sprang these health-cults, teaching, under crude psychology and cruder philosophy or a proud ignorance of both, the healing of the body through faith in a formula. How rapidly some of these cults have grown!

Preachers and physicians united to laugh at them, scorn them, anathematize them; but yet they grew, and yet they grow. As the ministry and medicine separated, medical schools became more and more materialistic—even atheistic. The doctor or the surgeon could find nothing but the body, therefore his drugs or his scalpel must cure or kill. How alarming became the condition to a thoughtful Christian, few realize. The new health-cults flung their challenge to the medical fraternity. "The mind has greater healing power than your drugs." The doctors laughed, but began to question. Honest physicians said to each other, we have scores of cases in our practice where medicine does more harm than good, yet we are helpless.

Meanwhile psychology was pressing its newer revelations. Men discovered that in that vast area of every individual, called the subconscious or dissociated self, lay marvelous therapeutic powers. Lull to rest the conscious self, the active, thinking, choosing self, and there lies, fully open, that great deep of the subconscious. It has no power of choice. It takes into itself whatever is sufficiently impressed there, and later returns it to consciousness as a positive fact.

With a firm, strong voice, colored with faith and vibrant with confidence, let the preacher-physician speak into that open sub-

consciousness of his patient truths of health, ambition, faith, love, those truths are somehow taken up by the nervous system, by the inner life, the subconscious, and result in restoration to health, new ambition, new faith in God.

Hypnotism, the hypnagogic state, suggestion, and autosuggestion have found their scientific places and, properly controlled and directed, have produced results in health, hope, and faith to thousands, such results that the seeming fairy stories of the health-cults have been far outdone. I should like to give you, out of my own records, experiences in individual cases where cures have been wrought of such a nature as to stagger my own belief. In these cures, faith in God, quotations from his word, and conversation with him, are found to be of the greatest therapeutic value. Whatever the psychologically trained physician is doing in the great clinics of London and Paris and Berlin, the fact remains that a psychologically trained preacher and Christian worker can bring about equal results and at the same time multiply his possibilities a thousand fold, of winning the patients to Jesus Christ.

The modern disciple can take in a scientific form what seemingly those early disciples took in a direct form from their Master and go forth to preach the gospel and heal the sick as did they. They blindly believed, and impressed men with the fact of their power in belief. Cures were effected by this power. The modern disciple may scientifically believe and employ all the forces of the Master in effecting cures.

To recapitulate: Jesus Christ spent a large part of his recorded ministry in healing the sick. He sent his disciples forth to do as he had done. When the new church was established, following his ascension, they continued the practice. Modern discoveries in psychology have brought to the modern disciple a scientific basis upon which to work, taking the cure of diseases out of the realm of the miraculous. All this is in line with man's advance in knowledge.

Now, because the cure of the sick was the practice and command of Christ; because a similar power may now be used in a scientific manner corresponding to the spirit of the age; because there are multitudes susceptible to the gospel only through this



agency; because the practice of this healing power brings the modern disciple into closest spiritual relations with those whom he would reach, and could not otherwise approach; because it restores the preacher to his old position of genuine spiritual adviser; because vast human suffering may be relieved and many more be won to our Lord Jesus Christ; because, notwithstanding the marvelous advance in medical and surgical skill, there yet remains to the human heart an inborn faith in the divine power for healing, available to the priests of God; therefore we declare that psycho-therapy is a function of the church.

But to what extent is it a function of the church? Music is a function of the church, and education and art! Shall the church become teachers in such schools? The specialization of these into great professional departments has answered the question. The church is vitally concerned in the development of these departments, but cannot now, as formerly, take them under her own control. Shall there be an exception in the great department of healing ministry? This department, too, has become an independent science. Shall every church establish a clinic for the treatment of functional disorders? Shall every pastor become a physician, spending the major part of his strength in clinical work, and every church become a hospital? This, I take it, is the real significance of the question under discussion, and to this I now address myself.

That the church has a healing mission no one will dispute. That very few pastors have the qualifications to keep them balanced in such a work, is beyond question. Therefore, my first recommendation is this: let our divinity schools establish strong courses of study in psycho-therapy, and furnish their students opportunity to practice the Christian art of healing, as well as the Christian art of preaching. This will enable those schools to bring about a much-needed reform in pastor training; will teach the students how to become personal soul-winners because of their Christian conversation with the sick as they seek to cure them; will bring the student to a true realization of the grandeur and dignity of his position, as a chosen servant of God, sending him to his pastorate clothed with knowledge and power—an ambassador from Jehovah. The sight to make angels weep is the

helplessness of most divinity-school graduates in their first parishes.

My next recommendation is the grouping of churches for the healing ministry in functional disorders. Such a recommendation comes from physicians themselves. Such a recommendation is forced upon us, by the marvelous spreading of these numerous health-cults, that have attained to such numbers and power in the name of the Christian religion. Every doctor awake to this new, yet old, duty of the church acknowledges that he has scores of patients which pastors alone can cure, through psycho-therapy as an agent of religion.

Pastors of the grouping churches should serve allotted times in the clinics. Even though physicians do become skilful in psycho-therapy, as indications now declare that they will, yet that fact will not set aside the same need of trained pastors for such work. Not a separate building or hospital, in which such clinics will be held, is needed, but modern churches built for the daily service of the community, rather than churches built to be closed six days in the week that they may gain a holy smell for the seventh day.

I group the churches rather than the denominations, because every finger of the twentieth century points to our fearful weakness in Protestantism, and every voice calls for federation and organic union. In calling for such action in the treatment of *functional* disorders, I am not overlooking the care of *organic* diseases. We have wasted so much human grain ripened for the harvest, because of our failure just here. We all know the blind faith of the sick in the power of a godly pastor. They submit to the ministrations of the surgeon or doctor, and then turn to the man of God, saying, "Pray for me!" That inborn faith has a firm hold in human hearts! Why? Because back of all human skill we instinctively seek the skill of the Great Physician. Is it not shameful how the church has given over the care of the sick to others, and betrayed such faith in her God-given powers? As Christianity triumphs in the future, not chaplains of greater or less efficiency shall minister in those hospitals wholly under the control of outside forces, but pastors, awake, active, godly pastors, shall minister by turn in the hospitals of their section, as minis-

tered the priests, by course, in the temple at Jerusalem. Each pastor, trained for this healing ministry, will be alert to use his powers wherever in his own parish and work he goes. His children will become to him a greater personal care. His young people can be awakened and trained to far greater efficiency. His whole ministry will be enriched by the new personal contact with his people. By this method of grouping churches for healing ministrations, the pastor will not be led away from his first modern function—that of *preaching*. Anything that will rob him of his pulpit preparation and power will be a calamity of the direst sort. To preach was he called. He must preach. Preaching has been the pillar of the Protestant world. It hath pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save millions. Every other activity of a pastor's life must be tributary to his preaching.

The clergyman's life embraces three offices, that of prophet who foretells the things of God; that of physician who heals the body and the self; that of preacher, who interprets to his generation the will and deeds of God in his generation, and urges a personal surrender to him. And now abide prophet, physician, and preacher, these three, but the greatest of these is the preacher.

But what is the place of the medical fraternity in this new alignment of forces? Can civilization dispense with such a profession? I was in conversation with one of New England's greatest specialists in anaesthesia, a physician with an enormous practice. He said, "If the religion of Jesus Christ could find its way down into the heart of every man, woman, and child, and have its rightful sway there, lawyers and doctors could go to farming."

Until we reach that glad day, what place shall the doctors hold in the healing ministry of the church? I have already revealed his exalted place. The minister cannot train himself as a diagnostician. The doctor must do that. The minister, therefore, must work only after the specialist has discovered the disease and revealed its functional depredations. Let the minister be equipped psychologically and psycho-therapeutically, working hand in hand with skilful physicians, and the marvelous results thus far attained are but glimmers before the coming day. Why, this new grip of Christian truth applied psychologically will revolutionize the study

of medicine and eventually bring to the Christian faith, as its mightiest ally, the whole medical fraternity. If ministers can be trained, after proper diagnosis by a disease specialist, how to bring faith and personal communion with our Lord Jesus Christ to bear upon the health of that rapidly increasing multitude of people, bitterly suffering from functional disorders, and if they can vastly allay the sufferings of those cursed with organic diseases, then our Christian religion will find a mighty increment of power in winning this world to itself.

As in every forward movement, there is danger from the crank, the quack, the religiously insane. Yet the healing ministry must go forward, physician and pastor hand in hand.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We will now proceed to hear the appointed speakers. The first is Rev. Allan B. Philputt, of Indianapolis.

REV. ALLAN B. PHILPUTT (Disciple), Indianapolis, Ind., addressed the Congress as follows:

#### SHOULD PSYCHO-THERAPEUTICS BE PRACTICED BY THE CHURCHES?

In the last few years we have been thrown into a sort of hysteria by the rapid progress of Christian Science. Both the churches and the medical profession have shared in the surprise at the ease with which many intelligent and well-meaning people seem to have been drawn away from their old-time ideas and swept onward in a movement which, though they could not explain it, seemed to meet a need; and the explanation of the rapid growth of this cult is doubtless due in large part to the fact, first, that it had, though with many absurd incrustations, gotten hold of the real principle of healing and helping; and second, because it came upon a time when the church was not meeting the everyday needs of the people. We were not using, by any manner of means, the full spiritual power of the gospel to help and bless the lives of the people.

The onset of this new cult in many communities has been so vigorous and sudden that numbers of people have been swept off their feet and have come to the conclusion that the old science and

the old theology were alike giving way before a blind working principle which cannot be rationally accounted for. As a matter of fact, we have vastly overrated the influence which Christian Science and the new movements generally have attained, and have quite failed to recognize the fact, which any sensible person must have seen from the beginning, that in the forms in which they have come to us their influence must in large measure be ephemeral; either they must greatly revise and modify their claims and rationale or they must speedily wane when the sober second thought of the people has time to assert itself. The truth is that in any community of which I have any knowledge, where four or five years have elapsed since the coming, in any popular way, of these new views, the tide is already arrested, if not on the wane. In the community in which I live, which may be, I think, representative, there has not been any very convincing evidence that the claims of Christian Science have justified themselves by results. This is not to say that people have not occasionally been helped; that some diseases have not been cured; and that many religious derelicts—the flotsam and jetsam of the church membership—have not found anchorage and interest in the new theories. I would not deny this movement any real good that it has done. Indeed, it has taught us some lessons we needed to learn, but it has not cured disease in the way in which its adherents claim. Its votaries when really sick have generally gone back to the old programme of resorting to the medical profession; and the percentage of sickness and death among them is practically on a par with that among any other class of people similarly situated. They, however, have been the pioneers in a movement which is destined in other ways and by other channels to affect modern thought to no inconsiderable extent. That there is a healing power in the mind no one can successfully deny.

Psycho-therapy is a science and not a religion. By the more or less intelligent use of its principles cures have been wrought alike by Christian Science healers, by faith and mental healers, by Roman Catholic relics, by Buddhist and Mohammedan priests and by evangelical churchmen.

What has been accomplished under the claims of a particular religious dogma has been accomplished even more satisfactorily

in the quiet and unostentatious way of science by those who profess to make no use of religion at all, such as, for instance, Drs. DuBois, Jenet, Berrilon, and Tuckey. These cures, when they are successful at all, are made by powers which reside in the mind, and are not dependent on any special form of religious faith. This is not to say that religious faith may not be a key to unlock the secret powers, or a most helpful adjunct in the healing process. If, however, we consider it with the notion that we are dealing with a religious principle instead of a purely scientific problem, we shall start wrong and never get right. I believe that in the course of human progress it was divinely intended that the healing art should be differentiated from spiritual leadership. The great scientific knowledge that has come to us through the medical profession has certainly justified its existence as a special calling. Any setting of the mind-cure principle that professes to deny the results of biological and physiological investigation, and the laws of chemistry and the general results of laboratory and scientific study, as these pertain to the human body, its structure, its growth, and its decay, to the causes of disease and of contagion, to proper sanitation and all that, is doomed to be relegated to the limbo of the fantastic and the absurd. The general results of science will stand. The principle of cause and effect and the material laws as well as the psychical which govern the human body must ever be acknowledged. No healing by blind faith, by so-called divine power upon the part of the healer, can long be regarded with confidence.

As to the question whether the churches should undertake the practice of psycho-therapy, I am hardly prepared to say. There is a very general feeling that we must meet and stem this tide which has set upon us from strange and unexpected sources. But as I have already intimated, this particular tide will soon run its course. The thing for us to do is to recognize and use, as far as possible, the really sound principle beneath all the rubbish of error and fanaticism; but it occurs to me that this is largely to be done by the medical profession. They at least should add to their equipment a knowledge of the psychic laws which influence bodily health and be prepared to use them when opportunity offers. In fact, I think this will be the next great development in medi-

cine. It has long been vaguely known and partially practiced. The new thought has simply thrown the emphasis here and the development of modern psychology has revealed to us the fact that the mind has great powers of which we were but dimly aware. Mental therapeutics is bound to receive increased attention both in health and disease. The application of the psychic element should not be left to bungling experimenters nor to healers ignorant of the anatomical structure of the human body.

I can see here also a very considerable development in the ministry. They too should understand the psychic forces with which they have to deal, and this more often for the sake of those who are not sick than for those who are. The number of people at any given time who are really sick is inconsiderable; and the number who might be amenable to psychic influence is still smaller. The minister of the gospel cannot, it seems to me, forsake the larger duties of his calling and devote himself in any special manner to these few. They may come under his influence as a part of his general parish work, and when he enters the sick-room or deals with a suffering patient, it well becomes him to know how to do so in the most intelligent and sympathetic way. If, however, he should give himself in a special degree to this matter, I can see several dangers ahead. Were he unusually successful in his treatment of the sick and the nervous, finding this to be his long suit, he would naturally throw himself into it to the exclusion of other and larger duties. He might become so engrossed in it that he would ultimately be curing people who were not sick and other parts of his work would suffer. Then if the churches generally should undertake the practice of psycho-therapy, in the wake of those really ill would come a horde of freaks and fanatics who would divert its energies from sober tasks to all sorts of occultism, thus bringing the church into disfavor with the more sane and sensible people.

I make no criticism of those churches which have taken hold of this work and have given a demonstration. They have been exceptionally equipped with men for the task, and they have done well to show not only the need but the practicability of the use of mental suggestion in certain forms of disorders. Given at any time an ideal situation, a minister well born, amply trained, of fine

personality, and of magnetic presence, I should say the doors that opened to him in this direction were the call of God to service.

I believe, too, in the very great wisdom of the Emmanuel Movement in that it places at the threshold of such experiments a capable physician to give his diagnosis and to advise as to further treatment. Where, therefore, you have the ideal minister and the ideal physician, one willing to give up even an affluent patient to the gentler measures of mental suggestion instead of a course in *materia medica*, the opportunity offers for such a combination. In great centers where many people are oppressed by the very bigness of outward things and the struggle of life, where the hopeless, the nervous, and the visionary congregate and live, there might be with great propriety such enterprises as those which have come in the wake of the Emmanuel Movement. I should say, upon the whole, let the minister do what he can, and let the ministerial student of the future be trained in psychology and all things pertaining thereto. But suddenly to engraft upon our present-day church organization a sort of psychic dispensary, would be a matter of doubtful wisdom.

I see in this movement something that is going to bless the world. When that glorious early church burst forth resplendent upon mankind, it was an avalanche of spiritual power; it had a gift for everyone, there was healing and joy in it; it sanctified the people, body, soul, and spirit; it healed their bodies and saved their souls. Today the evangelical churches have not seemed to have as distinct a message as they once had. People go to church mostly to make pleasant social acquaintances; it never occurs to them that there is a power there to save their souls, or that they need any such saving. "The soul," they say, "what is that? I know nothing about it." The Christian Scientists say, "Come with us, we will cure your diseases and heal your body." That is definite; it may be fraud, but it seems to be something here and now, and in the first impulse there is a prompting to many to test the new theory and see if there be not something worth while in it. So that the church of the future will, in my judgment, pay less attention to dogma and speculative creed and more to helping the everyday needs of men and women. This church will help the sick, but it will do more than that; mental suggestion



may be used upon the well. The great masses of people, while enjoying health of body, are stupid, indifferent, and callous about the great things of life. We talk of our system of education; it has its merits, but it does not educate. When school days are over, and from that very hour, people tend to lapse back to ignorance, narrowness, and selfishness. Very few are alive or awake in more than a tithe of their powers. Knowledge in all its higher ranges has little interest for the vast multitudes. They live in prejudice and self-content. Life is dull to them because its interests are few.

I can see in the minister of the gospel, who may acquire the art of touching and bringing into strength the hidden and quiescent forces and powers of men and women, kindling their best and holiest desires to know and to feel, the true physician of the soul. That the multitudes should be drawn out of their stupor and enlivened with the great thoughts that men have set forth and the great deeds they have accomplished, is of more importance even than that the sick should be made well.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: The last of the appointed speakers is Dr. R. P. Johnston, of New York City.

REV. R. P. JOHNSTON, D.D. (Baptist), New York City, addressed the Congress as follows:

#### IS PSYCHO-THERAPEUTICS A FUNCTION OF THE CHURCH?

*Mr. President:* Notwithstanding the somewhat hazy and uncertain boundaries of the realms designated by the terms "psychic" and "therapeutic," the question before us is one of definite and specific limitations. In the discussion we are to essay neither a feat of aviation nor an excursion into the fascinating realm of the occult, but standing firmly upon solid ground we are to consider a practical problem in the light of common-sense.

Please notice the question. It is not, Is there such a thing as psychics? not, Is there such a thing as therapeutics? not even, Is there such a thing as psycho-therapeutics?—we freely admit at the very outset that there are such things. But the question is, Shall the church, in addition to her other manifold forms of

ministry, adopt psycho-therapy as a definite, public, organic function?

But "the church" is composed of "churches," and as these local bodies do the work of "the church," the question really becomes, Shall the individual church adopt psychic healing as one of its specific and publicly recognized functions?

It is quite conceivable that the churches may be in heartiest sympathy with every sane and legitimate effort to minimize disease and suffering; they may contribute to hospitals and training schools; may support the most scientific medical training and research in their universities; may foster special institutions of research and co-operate in sanitary movements and efforts in general, without feeling that it is wise for them to adopt the healing of disease as their direct, personal function. It may be the duty of members of a church or even of the pastor to practice psycho-therapeutics or other systems of therapeutics, and the church may wish them God-speed in their ministry without feeling at all obligated to take up the practice of any system of therapeutics as her public, institutional function.

It is not, therefore, a question of the church's sympathy and co-operation in the battle against disease and suffering. This has been heartily given through all the centuries. It is a question of the method of manifesting her sympathy and co-operation. Is the church, as an institution, fitted and equipped to enter upon the direct, personal practice of a system of healing? Is it the wisest and sanest policy for her to adopt?

But should the church conclude that the practice of therapeutics is her function, why should she deliberately limit herself to this one branch of therapeutics? Why should she discriminate against other reputable phases of the healing science and art? Is it because this form of healing is more scientific or less? Is it more important or less? Is skill more necessary or less? Is it more easily acquired or less? Does the church specially select this field of healing because she possesses special insight, authority, and power in this realm? Is it because diseases of the body—organic diseases—are less important or more? Are they less frequent, malignant, stubborn, and fatal, or more? Why draw a line through the field of disease and say this portion we leave to

the scientific practice of medicine and surgery, the other portion we claim as the domain of the church? Is all this an effort to be sane and scientific or is it the survival and pietistic recrudescence of an age-long tendency to associate religion with the occult? Is it an effort to commit the church anew to the fascinating philosophy and practice of occultism? I am not here formulating a theory; I am merely seeking for light.

Against the too hasty and general adoption by the church of psycho-therapeutics as her special field and her definite organic function, I am persuaded that a word or two of caution would not be amiss.

The first is, can the church afford, just yet, to put her sanction upon, and commit herself to, any one of the philosophies underlying this whole movement? The church has not always been too careful of her science and she has suffered many times from having been compelled to abandon her position and to readjust herself to the results of scientific investigations and discoveries. Her past experience should at least render her a bit cautious in committing herself.

It is not a display of bitter opposition and narrow conservatism to ask for more light. Investigators in the psychic realm are by no means of one mind in their conclusions. Weighty authorities are placed over against weighty authorities. Some speak confidently of the science of psycho-therapeutics, while others as strenuously deny that it has attained to the dignity of a science. Certain well-attested phenomena have emerged from the unsounded and uncharted psychic sea. They are flashes out of unknown deeps. But there is no general unanimity in the explanation and systematization of these strange phenomena. To be sure there are rival theories, each laying claim to the dignity of a science, but as yet there is no well-attested and reasoned science. There may be one some day, but just now there is only chaos. The babel of "Christian Science," "Faith Healing," "Mind Healing," "New-Thought Therapeutics," "the Emmanuel Movement," and other not less vociferous claimants of therapeutic power may render it *probable* that we are on the verge of an unexplored continent in man, they also render it *certain* that as yet we are fairly ignorant of its nature and extent. It is not altogether

certain that these modern movements are not rather a new emphasis and exaggeration of what has long been known, rather than the discovery of things hitherto unknown. It is also a question if the attempt to make this new system of healing a function of the church is not an attempt to confine to the church a ministry which has hitherto been much broader and much more general than the present movement contemplates.

Men talk today most fascinatingly and learnedly about the marvelous subconscious or supraconscious mind. But what is this new wonder? Is it a new entity or a new label? Is the subconscious or supraconscious man a distinct being from the conscious man, or is he the product of the reflex action of the conscious man? Have we not always contended that man was a body indwelt by a soul, that he is more than the sum total of his visible, ponderable constituents? Have we not always spoken of latent powers, mysterious capacities, wonderful characteristics? Does calling these mysterious things by a new name add a great deal to our actual stock of knowledge concerning their ultimate essence and modes of operation?

We also hear learned discussions of the power of mind over matter. But have we not for a long time been aware of that potent fact? Has not every invention for the utilization of nature's forces and laws been a triumph of mind over matter; the steam engine not less than psycho-therapeutics? But have we not also been all too conscious of the limitations of the power of mind over matter in many directions? Has not the mountain refused to move, even though Mohammed or Mrs. Eddy command it? Has not cancer refused to cease its gnawings at the heart-strings, even though some psycho-therapist has demanded it?

We are further inducted by awesome whispers into the sanctum of the strange power of suggestion and of his twin brother, or psychic echo, auto-suggestion. But what are they? Are they phases of that other over-worked mystery, hypnotism? But what is hypnotism? Is it a force radiating from personality, by virtue of which a strong or intelligent personality can subdue in a psychic way a weak or ignorant one? Is auto-suggestion the power of a strong, subconscious self over a weak, conscious self? If so, have we not always preached or practiced it—not as an

organic function of the church, but as a wider human ministry? Have we not long known the influence of mind over mind, of will over will? Have we not always appealed to men of weak wills and strong lusts and appetites to call into power the latent elements of their manhood and thus overcome the evil, and have they not done so in numberless cases? We have not called it suggestion, or auto-suggestion, but we have all practiced it and have not thought of limiting it to the narrower function of the church. It is a broad, human ministry.

But we are told that certain nervous diseases can be cured by suggestion—that courage, purpose, hope may be induced instead of fear, confusion, and despair. But from the beginning of social life among men has not friend been performing that ministry for friend, counselor for client, physician for patient, and minister for a perfect host of discouraged, bewildered, baffled, and beaten souls? Has not the ministry and the whole moral teaching force of society sought to arouse, inspire, lead back into the right path, and put heart and courage and hope into men? They have not called it suggestion, but have their efforts been less efficient under another name? Why limit and emphasize as a special function of the church ministries which the church and all other friendly institutions and forces of society have always performed?

But we are told that many marvelous cures have been wrought by psycho-therapeutics, and we do not doubt the assertion for a moment. So have wonderful cures been wrought by surgery and medical therapeutics. Shall the church therefore adopt surgery and medicine as her organic and personal function? But it is insisted that cures have been wrought by psycho-therapy in the realm of nervous diseases, when surgery and materia medica were powerless. So have cures in this realm been wrought by bread pills, by bones of saints, by relics of apostles, by holy coats, by miraculous springs, by the incantations of Indian medicine men, by the grunts and contortions of howling dervishes, by amulets and charms, ikons and images, and by hosts of other artifices for working upon a morbid, distempered imagination or for directing the currents of the mind and will along some less ego-tistic channels. Shall the church take up all this, lay in a supply of bones, go into the business of dispensing holy water, amulets,

and charms, acquire a wardrobe of holy coats, because, forsooth, certain neurasthenics have been cured by these means?

But what is the healing agency in all these cases? It is time that we achieve some rational light on this point. As a matter of fact they have very largely been associated with religion. Are we justly to infer from this that the curative agent is divine power? If so, then as one surveys the field he is bound to say that the Almighty has worked through strange instruments and has chosen strange company. In an old book we are told that the secrets of the Lord are with them that fear him. But there are some modern schools of psycho-therapy which deny the very existence of God, and yet they accomplish feats of healing. No faith in God is required and yet we are told that without faith it is impossible to please him. History bears strong testimony to the fact that no integrity of character, no special intelligence, no seasoned knowledge of the laws of being are necessary to effect cures in this realm. A stock of presumption and a few meaningless phrases seem to go much farther than upright character, faith in God, or an intelligent knowledge of the laws of life. Is that the way God works?

But if the healing agency be divine power, then why limit it to the field of nervous and functional disorders? Is God powerless in other spheres? Has he command of the nerves only, or is he partial to neurotics? As a matter of fact, many believers in psychic healing have claimed, and do yet claim, to perform their cures by divine power—they boldly assert direct divine intervention and draw no limits. But the new movement is more cautious and timid. It is not so sure that the remedial agency is divine, or that organic diseases ought to be admitted to its sphere of operation. Christian Science is false in its premises but consistent in its conclusions. The Emmanuel Movement is half true in its premises but inconsistent in its conclusions. Sometimes it almost claims that it heals by direct divine power. It speaks of God's limitless might. But there it draws back and begins to talk of a general law of life underlying all its cures of healing. But its position is not happy in either case. For if the healing is due to direct divine intervention, then it is inconsistent to limit God to one class of ailments. But if a general psychic law underlies all

these cures of healing, one can hardly escape the conclusion that the sensible course to pursue would be to seek by patient investigation and experiment to learn the nature of this law and the methods of its operation. The whole subject ought, in that case, to be approached and investigated in a scientific, rational spirit. It needs to be lifted out of the regions of religious mysticism and superstitious occultism.

The point I make is that the law of psychics is just as divine as, and no more so than, the law of gravitation. Why then seek to invest it with a kind of religious sanctity? Why not say it has no special religious significance; why not do away with all the ignorance that prevails concerning it? Why seek to make it a function of the church? If any man in the church or out of it can heal by it, let him do so. It is a species of deception for which the church sooner or later must suffer, for her representations to claim to do in the name of and by virtue of the power of religion that which can be done just as effectively without any appeal to or relation with religion. Let us be done with double dealing and not follow the policy of priest and medicine man, by claiming to possess some peculiar, divine power. To my thinking it would be infinitely wiser and saner for the church to exert her influence toward an intelligent and scientific investigation of the great law involved in all forms of psychic healing, that whatever of therapeutic value it possesses may be discovered and utilized. It is not honest and worthy of her to adopt as one of her special functions the practice of hypnotism, word jugglery, and the calling up of spirits from the vast deeps of subconsciousness for the purpose of impressing morbid imaginations and working on distempered nerves under the assumption that because she is the church she possesses special divine power and prerogatives in a world of law.

This leads in the next place to the question, if the pressing of psycho-therapy to the fore, the overemphasis resulting from exalting it into a recognized function of the church, the rendering of it so conspicuous in the thought and life of the community, would not, by the very law of suggestion which it invokes, tend to create and pander to an unsane, unsound mental and nervous condition. Would it not breed more neurotics than it would

cure? For diseases which can be healed by suggestion can be produced by suggestion. Such an action on the part of the church would be regarded by many as a justification to indulge in morbid imaginings and as a sanction of divine authority upon the rock-bottomed reality of all nervous vagaries, hallucinations, and hypochondrias.

Such an exaltation of the practice of this art into a function of the church would catch the imagination and awaken the lively interest of persons with unsane tendencies. They would flock to the church. The press would give special prominence to this phase of church activity, and other saner but not less necessary phases of ministry would fall into the background and in many cases entirely disappear. Would not the inevitable consequence be an unsaneness of mind and spirit and a paralysis of sound judgment and discrimination?

Apart from the question of the effect upon the soundness of mind in the community, there arises another question of the effect of such action on the part of the church upon the support of hospitals and sanatoria. The leaders of the movement may at present draw a line between functional and organic diseases, but will their followers preserve this line? The question already arises, why draw a line at all? And with all due deference to the leaders in this art of healing, no satisfactory answer has yet been forthcoming. The question will grow more persistent, not less; and the very fountains of supplies for our hospitals and other necessary equipment in the scientific battle against disease will be threatened. Who can measure the calamity and the unspeakable pathos of such an effect, not only upon the myriad sick, but upon the sound and healthy as well?

Then, too, there is another phase of the question that is of deepest importance. Beyond question, the element of hypnotism enters to a greater or less degree into all such systems of therapeutics, whether it be so labeled or not. But what is hypnotism? A scientific definition is not attempted, but practically it is the dominance of one will over another. It is a species of depersonalization. What effect does it have on the will and character of the subject? Many who have most thoroughly gone into this matter are of the opinion that hypnotism weakens the will and exerts



a deleterious influence upon the character. Many of the most scientific and conscientious physicians utterly refuse to employ it. It is quite conceivable that a nervous or imaginary disease may be cured at too great a cost to personality. To depersonalize the patient in order to heal a nervous disease would be to drive out one devil only to give a place for seven worse devils. At any rate, the church ought to study the matter carefully and exhaustively before she plunges into a policy that would minister to unsaneness of mind, that would tend to sap the support of the scientific equipment for the battle against disease, or that might leave any portion of society without power to act from the impulses of normal personality. Again I venture to suggest that the adoption of the practice of psycho-therapy as a function of the church would open wide doors of opportunity for conscienceless fakirism to exploit itself and wax fat upon the credulity and superstition of the masses; it would encourage unskilled clumsiness to work havoc amid the finer mechanisms of the human mind and spirit, and would lead to the subtlest temptations and in many cases to shameless immoralities, all under the sacred sanction of religion.

Let it freely and gladly be granted that the vast majority of ministers in this field would be conscientious, faithful, and above reproach. But we cannot for that reason shut our eyes to facts clear as day and old as the race.

The church has never been free from quacks and fakirs. Despite all efforts to discourage and curb them, they have continued to thrive. Now make psycho-therapy a function of the church and you practically dissolve the injunction against them and multiply opportunities for them to enter into fruitful fields. There would be developed in and out of the church a horde of fakirs more hurtful than the great throng of patent-medicine venders, nostrum hawkers, and poison dispensers who now afflict society and fatten off the ills and ignorance of humanity. Legitimate practitioners have always frowned upon quackery, but it flourishes nevertheless, and under the sanction of the church fakirism in the psychic art would thrive more abundantly.

In addition, every minister who, for lack of fitness or application, finds the ordinary ministries of the pastorate irksome, or his

congregations diminishing, would turn to this psychic refuge with a sigh of relief—never mind if he be utterly ignorant of psychics or of therapeutics; never mind if he be unskilled and without fitness for this ministry; he must have a congregation in order to hold his place. True, society, guided by experience, demands that a man shall make careful and scientific preparation to practice medicine. But the church is a divine institution, the minister holds his diploma from the Almighty and cannot think of submitting to such inferior practical laws and safeguards. And thus, however unfitted, he goes forth with the imprimatur of the church upon him, to fumble among the delicate springs of a human soul. The proverbial bull in the china closet would be the very superlative of fitness in comparison.

Then again the temptations arising from such a course would be inevitable and subtle beyond measure. Keep in mind always that this is the function of the church, that hypnotism is one of its chief assets and abnormality its field of operation, and it is left to your sane judgment and sober common-sense to compute the probabilities and weigh the results. And the church, the bride of Christ, whose honor and purity are her life, the church is to put her sanction upon it all.

Once more I dare affirm that for the church to adopt psychotherapeutics as her function would be for her to reverse the age-long policy in pursuit of which she has attained such notable progress and such noble triumphs. It would be a step backward and not forward, downward and not upward.

A glance at history is sufficient to reveal the fact that man has progressed just in proportion as the rational element and the scientific method have superseded the irrational and unscientific. Twentieth-century civilization is the product of the application of rational and scientific principles. The law that applies to society in general applies nowhere more forcefully than in the realms of religion and medicine. Their territories border upon the realm of the occult. These two sister sciences have been overrun, harassed, impeded, dishonored, by irrationalism and superstition as scarcely no other science has. What struggles have they not had to wage against ignorance and credulity, against magic and necromancy, against false prophets and conjurors, against charms

and superstitions, against occultism in all its myriad guises. But slowly they have fought their way through fog and fen, through marsh and morass, to the solid ground of common-sense, reasonableness, and law. Many of the worst foes of medicine have cloaked themselves under the mantle of religion, and many of the bitterest foes of religion have stolen and worn the garb of medicine. But the two sisters—healers of the hurts of soul and body—have risen together, Godlike and free. They have alike become more intelligent, more wise, more scientific. They have learned that the universe is one of law; that cause and effect are always related, and that man, physical, mental, and spiritual, is a creature under law. Magic has slowly been driven back and uncrowned, quackery has been discredited. Problems are to be solved only by patient investigation and experiment. If there is a therapeutic value in psychics, then it too must be differentiated, searched out, and applied in the spirit of science, and in the name of God and humanity. But the church as an institution has no special authority, fitness, or equipment to make herself the custodian of this art of healing. But someone will say, Did not Jesus so heal men, and the apostles? But I do not read that they confined themselves to functional derangements. If you claim that it is the will of Jesus that the church still heal, then show your authority by causing an eye that has been taken out to grow back; cause a limb that has been lost to replace itself; raise a few dead people to life. Do something that requires a specific intervention of divine power if you are the custodians of Christ's healing power, and do not confine yourself to a field where men who do not believe in God or in Jesus can duplicate your cures. Do not claim that you perform certain acts by virtue of certain religious faiths when men with no religious faith can do the same thing. Let your rod swallow the rods of the other magicians.

I am not affirming that psycho-therapeutics is in itself pure superstition. I do not so believe. I regard it as a perfectly legitimate field of investigation and practice. I hope to see the day when its entire therapeutic efficiency will be scientifically and intelligently used against disease. But what I do affirm is that the church is unprepared, unfitted, and by the very nature of the case is not the proper body to attempt the practice of this art.

For her to arrogate to herself this function would be to take a long step back toward the slough of magic, fakirism, miracle-working quackery and superstition, out of which she has so painfully struggled.

Just a word more. A mere glance at the history of the progress of religion shows that under different names and philosophies there have always been practicers of the psychic art. They have generally flourished when the life of the church was at a low ebb, her vision uncertain, her mission indistinct, and her faith wavering. Such a period were the centuries before and after the coming of Christ, when a belief in magic was almost universal. Such a period was the Middle Ages when great pilgrimages to famous shrines resulted in marvelous cures. In periods, however, when the life of the church is virile, her vision clear, her activities and purposes definite, her spirit militant, these sicklier forces fall into the shadows of the background.

In modern times the widespread adoption of the evolutionary philosophy, the results of historic and literary criticism of the sources of our faith, a wider, truer knowledge of the phenomena of religious history in general, together with new social problems born out of modern conditions, have compelled the church to readjust her theology and philosophy, and to rearrange her plans and methods. For a time she has been hesitant, bewildered, confused. She has been seeking to get her bearings and to work out anew her way to the goal of her mission. In these moments of perplexity and hesitancy, out of the shadows have emerged hosts of would-be-guides, saying to the church, follow us, we will be your guide. Many individuals have listened to their claims and pleas and have gone after them into the swamp and fog of metaphysics and unreason. And now psycho-therapy comes and says, "Follow me, I have enough power to cure hysteria; it is not much, but it will do. I dare not be consistent in my conclusions, but 'consistency is the bugbear of little minds.' True, other men who do not believe in God can do quite as much as we, but if we will only call it a divine power and make it a function of the church we can keep a few people a long time in darkness. For people love to associate religion and occultism."

For myself, Mr. President, I hesitate to believe that the

leaders in the church, men of sane judgment, will consent to abandon the star by which the church has journeyed for centuries, to follow after the flickering will-o'-the-wisps which emerge from the unexplored regions of subconsciousness, which are themselves the sickly products of decay, and which burn with the strange fires of hypnotism, occultism, and superstition. The function of the church is saner, deeper, and higher than that of playing the part of the high-priestess of exorcism in the unsane realm of neurotics.

### DISCUSSION

PRESIDENT JACKSON: I have great pleasure now in introducing Bishop Fallows, of Chicago.

RIGHT REV. SAMUEL FALLOWS, D.D., LL.D.:

*Mr. President, and Brethren:* I should like nothing better than to have in cold print before me the eloquent and discursive address of my honored brother who has just preceded me. I would like exceedingly to have him as a patient in my church clinic. I think, perhaps, when I had gone through with the review of the address and with a personal interview, that he would not differ on any essential point, essential point, understand, any more than Dr. MacDonald and Dr. Durkee would differ. I recognize fully the thorough need of the scientific understanding of all that relates to this great question of psychical healing, and therefore I have linked myself with many of the leading neurologists of the world in setting forth, on the purely scientific and educational side, the great subject of psycho-therapeutics.

This somewhat formidable word is only about fifteen or sixteen years old. For the past fifteen years I have had the privilege of lecturing in a prominent medical college in this city on mental physiology and psycho-therapeutics. I think this was the first chair of the kind ever established in any medical institution in the world. And so the term psycho-therapeutics has, as you can clearly see, no terrors for me.

I may briefly answer one point raised by the last speaker, with regard to the healing power of the Christian ministry. Rev. Dr. A. J. Gordon, of sainted memory, answered it some time ago. He said in substance to his ministerial brethren: "You are com-

missioned and it is irrefutably commanded by your Divine Master to 'teach and preach and heal.' Who has taught you that your function is not to heal as well as to teach and preach? You say that you cannot perform the wonders which the Lord Jesus Christ and the apostles performed. You cannot heal all cases of sickness, and, therefore, you are not to attempt to heal at all. But you recognize fully that you are commissioned to preach the gospel to every creature and baptize them in the name of the Lord Jesus. You know that your business is to save souls and to bring them into the kingdom. Do you save all the souls to whom you preach? How many in your congregation have you brought to your Master's feet? Because you have not been the means of converting all to whom you have ministered, will you, therefore, abandon the ministerial work?"

The first two papers which were read, when fairly considered, are, in my judgment, perfectly unanswerable, if you take them in the full scope of their meaning. When I was consecrated bishop, and by your kindness, Mr. President, you know that in your graceful introductory remarks of yesterday, you made me a bishop of all the ministers in the city of Chicago, one of the specific injunctions given me in a most solemn manner was, "Heal the sick." And this injunction is given to every bishop of every church of the Episcopal character. I realized after a great many years of experience that as a bishop of the church, I had been quite neglectful of that fundamental injunction given me. I woke up some time ago to the fact that, after teaching five hundred graduate physicians, who are now practicing all over the country, the fundamental principles of psycho-therapeutics, in which were included the power of religious as well as mental influence, that I had been instructing others in the principles which I had not been specifically practicing myself. I had thought that want of time had not afforded me the opportunity. I was put in the position of one of Shakspeare's characters, who said, "I can better teach twenty what were good to be done than to be one of the twenty to follow mine own teaching."

Now, in the midst of a busy life, I have found both the time and the opportunity to help hundreds of persons in face to face interviews who have been suffering from depression, melancholia,

religious delusions, want of confidence, worry, and a number of other mental and spiritual ailments. A king's ransom could not purchase the joy and exquisite satisfaction I have experienced. I have had a genuine revival of religion going on all the time.

I pray every Sunday, as my church commands me to pray, "for all who are in any ways afflicted or distressed in mind, body, or estate." And just as far as possible, I have been answering this prayer, made as a general supplication, by bringing the eternal laws of God and of his Son, Jesus Christ, to bear upon those who are thus afflicted and suffering.

Do you think there can be any more danger connected with the sane, scientific and scriptural method of personal application of these great forces which my brethren and myself are making, than that inherently belongs to the ministerial life in general? What is the keynote of evangelism today? Personal work. Not merely official work, not work in the mass, but personal work. We have found that our parishoners and others have unburdened their souls to us, the accredited ministers of the historic Christ, as they have not done even to the most skilled physicians whom they have consulted. These skilled physicians and neurologists have sent me, on their own accord, patient after patient who they knew needed just the religious therapeutical help that I from my ministerial training and position could give.

With here and there an exception the progressive physicians and neurologists are recognizing the fact that we are carrying out in a legitimate manner the work they themselves are doing. There is no quackery or wild fire in it. They do not need any clergyman or layman to come to their aid against us as supposed intruders in their domain.

We must remember that persuasion is the main element in this personal treatment. Suggestion leashed upon the appeal to the reason is subsidiary to it. This pertinent and powerful agent every minister is continually employing. Suggestion he nearly as often uses. He appeals to reason and conscience through the conscious nature. These appeals sink into the subconscious part of the one undivided self and do their allotted work.

And now in conclusion: A well-known cult with scarcely a single scientific man or woman in it, led by a Chicago Board of

Trade man, who was once a member of my congregation, along with others having no better previous preparation for healing and lecturing, has come to the front for its alleged cures in the psychical realm. It has used suggestion although denying it and calling it by a pseudo-name to accomplish its results.

I look into your faces, so many of you college graduates, trained men in "the cure of souls," the best prepared men in the world to deal with the deepest questions of the human heart. I ask myself and I ask you, can there be any doubt as to your competency to minister to mind diseased, to inspire confidence in God and Christ and self, to bring hope and peace and joy to doubting and disordered souls, by pressing home the simple truth of an unfailing faith in the power of God and of his divine human Son to save them to the uttermost?

PRESIDENT JACKSON: I have great pleasure in inviting Prof. Geo. B. Foster to the platform to address us at this time.

PROFESSOR GEO. B. FOSTER:

My name was given to the chairman before Dr. Johnston made his address or I would not have allowed it to appear at all, for he made my speech, and all that is left for me to do, if I avoid repetition at all, is to take up in a rather optimistic way a chore or two that perhaps need to be done, very commonplace items, indeed.

In the first place, as a historic fact, have we as a church and as a people first gone to the Bible and found out what we ought to want, or have we first wanted it and then afterward gone to the Bible for it? Did we first go to the Bible and find out that it would allow slavery and then afterward practice slavery, or did we really want to hold slaves and then afterward go to the Bible for authority for it? And did we first go to the Bible and find out that nerves could be cured by supernatural materialism, and then secondly want our nerves cured that way? Did we first want to obey Jesus by imitating his cures and then get at it; or did we get at it and then go to him for authority on the subject? Which was it? And when we went to him for authority on the subject, did we have faith enough to go the whole length of it, or did we just have that faith which was coincident with the experiences that we had already achieved in the matter?



And then did we think of another thing, that historical science greatly abbreviates the healing ministry of Jesus as a fact? And secondly, that the aggregation and indication of a vast amount of this work on his part was supplied to his nobler ministry by his later followers who did not rise to his fine level, but dropped back again to materialistic materialism, which expected the bodies to be healed and made very nice and fine and sound so that they could enjoy the good things of this world?

At all events, is the thing that made the future, and that will continue to make the future, to be derived from the healings of Christ, from his work upon others in this regard, or is it to be derived from that in him on account of which he was crucified in an agony of pain? Which is it?

This whole business is an apostasy from Christ; not a heresy, an apostasy. This whole business is sub-Christian, men, pre-Christian. It was first physics, and then it is psycho-physics, but if we don't get out of the physical and the psychical, we have not got in sight of Christ, the real Christ. What Christ came to do was not primarily to relieve the world of pain, but to make the world equal to doing something, no matter how much pain it cost. Think what a stupid world it would be, what a monotonous thing it would be if everybody was therapeutically well! (Laughter.)

And besides that, if you are going to follow Christ, the way that he would heal the nerves of our people today with his fine ethical work would be like this: "Men of wealth, this child labor now will make neurotics by and by. You scoundrels! Stop this child labor! Millionaires, with your secret certificates of deposit, you are underpaying poor women. Give them fair wage and fewer hours. Treat them like brothers, and they won't be neurotics." That is what Christ would say to them. And the church that turns aside from them to psycho-therapeutics is falling below the mind of the Master, and it is entirely too easy, entirely too easy.

Besides, is it such an awful thing to be sick? There is John L. Sullivan, the slugger, and there was Elizabeth Barrett Browning in her invalid's chair, singing her enthusiastic song for Christ. Can John L. Sullivan's perfect health keep him from being a sinner? Can it keep his hands out of other men's pockets?

Will the neurotic Elizabeth Barrett Browning have unholy fire of lust flashing from her eyes? Oh, my friends, when you rise up to the ethical standpoint and see that it is the achievement of moral personality that is the great thing, it is not impossible that bad nerves shall contribute to it; not impossible.

What Jesus Christ came to do was not to help us get rid of pain and of suffering; what he came to do was to make us strong enough to rise to summits of morality not yet achieved, no matter how much pain and suffering it cost us, even if the doing of that required us to enter into situations where nerves would be racked and would go to pieces.

And as for the church entering upon this matter, the physicians have settled that; for the element of good in it all is simply this: It has reminded the physicians that man is more than the material; that man is also a psychical being, and they will, as they are already doing, steal the thunder of this whole business and possibly retire the distinguished and educated clergy from the job. That is what the physicians will do, and when the clergy come along and say, "But now we are practically out of a job; this gospel of ethico-spiritual religion is too hard for this soft age, we want you to take us into the boat," why, they won't let them in. The only good of it all is once more to call back the thought of the physician to the fact that man has mind to be taken into account and diseases and other things, and as fast as the physicians do this, as they are already doing it, and as it is their office to do, the ministry will have to come back to that harder job of morality and religion or else abdicate.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: Dr. Craig, of Denver, will now address us.

DR. BAYARD CRAIG:

*Mr. President, Members of the Congress:* When I consented to send up my name on this subject I did not know that such giants were to speak this morning. After hearing the last of the appointed speakers I was reminded of a story I heard out West the other day. A minister went to see a man who recently had an experience with a tornado and who had come out safe. As he told the story to the pastor, the pastor patted him on the back

and said, "The Lord must have been with you yesterday, my brother." "Well," he said, "if the Lord was with me yesterday, he was going some!" (Laughter.)

I felt that we were going some in listening to that speech. I could not but think, however, that the speaker was using something of hypnotism or something of mental suggestion when he won such applause to a whirlwind that was creating a cloud of dust around a question that I believe is one of the most important in the religious world of today. I would not attempt to speak upon it, but I feel its vast importance and dare not decline because there should be a last favorable word on this question.

I wish very much that Dr. MacDonald had my time that he might help to present in such a beautiful and convincing way the great truths of this subject. Brethren, it is not a question of bringing psycho-therapeutics as a function into our churches; it is already there. Psycho-therapeutics is not only a question of making the sick well, but also of keeping the well from getting sick. When the Lord Jesus Christ came into our troubled world and saw men with the lines of grief and sorrow upon their faces; saw the lack of peace that was within their hearts; saw them lost and bewildered and saw them afraid of the forces of nature and afraid of their fellow-men and afraid of their gods, when he came into this troubled world and said to men, "When you pray say, 'Our Father, Who art in Heaven'"—that was psycho-therapeutics. To teach the secret of peace and fearlessness to the soul of troubled man. He came that we might have peace, and any man or any woman in Chicago or in all the world today that knows how to say "Our Father! O thou lover of men, oh, thou friend and relentless benefactor; every moment of my life thou art caring for me and protecting me. What need I fear? Thou art with me." Every man and every woman that walks in the consciousness of that truth has received a large benefit of psycho-therapeutics.

Fear has been driven away, anxiety has been driven away, the pulses of life are throbbing in his veins and health is coming in, although he may oppose the statements in regard to faith healing as vigorously as Dr. Johnston. Consciously he is opposed to

faith healing, unconsciously he is enjoying its benefits by living a joyous Christian life.

Jesus healed. He healed all who had faith. I do not say that those who had no faith could not be healed, but all who had faith were healed. Has humanity changed from that day to this? When Jesus said, "According to your faith be it unto you," did he speak to men that had within them different potentialities from you and me today? Is Christ the same yesterday, today, and forever? Is human nature the same today that it was then? Then who shall forbid my belief in the perpetuity of that law, "According to your faith be it unto you"? And with all deference to this learned professor who has addressed you just before I came to the platform, and with all deference to the argument made by the vigorous doctor in his opposition to it, why should a thing which Jesus taught by precept and example be called "apostate"? I believe they condemned Jesus of Nazareth himself by their arguments. Magic and wonder-working were rampant in the world when Jesus came! How came it then that he took such a disreputable thing as miracles of healing and made them a function of his life, of his ministry, of his church?

DR. JOHNSTON: Mr. President, I did not say that.

DR. CRAIG: I thought that was very clearly implied. I do not wish to misrepresent you; indeed, I am not saying a word in controversy. If my voice takes on that tinge I don't mean it should; I simply say: "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear," and the point of view is so clear and plain to me that I have no possible argument about it at all.

Jesus healed by faith. He will heal by faith today. Science comes to tell us that we have in our body, in the white corpuscles of the blood, a constabulary that under proper generalship is sufficient for the protection of the body and for the healing of diseases; and in the last analysis the reason that Christianity has made a civilization that dominates the world is because it came into the world to fill up the sources of faith and hope and courage in the human heart. And wherever faith and hope and courage have been generated by the Christ and by his teaching there is

man strong to resist disease, and there is man strong to resist sin, and there is man at his best.

I only beg for sympathy and for the open mind in a great question like this for if the truth be in it or half the truth that is claimed, it means, not a new fad or a new fashion, but reclaiming to the church its Christlike and apostolic function, a function to convince the world that we do have the commission from Almighty God to go out with a message of salvation to man in mind and soul and body.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: We have but two more addresses and our session this afternoon begins at three o'clock, so we have plenty of time to hear these brethren. We will listen now to Rev. Thomas Moody from Matadi, Congo, Africa.

REV. THOMAS MOODY:

*Mr. President:* Some friend made a mistake by sending up my name, and I suppose it is because I represent the foreign field. But I believe today in psycho-therapeutics. I believe also in Jesus' commission to preach and to teach and to heal, and I think perhaps nine-tenths of all the foreign missionaries that go out into the field have something of that thing to do. I can only give an illustration or two in a brief way of what we have had to do out in Congo in that way.

I believe today personally that about nine-tenths of the people that say they are sick only think they are sick; and if psycho-therapeutics or mental healing or science, or any of those things have come in and done things to help people, why, I claim it is about time that the church took up her part in the doing of that work.

I remember once when I was going around preaching the gospel and teaching the people, and along with that, of course, we had the healing of the sick—it comes in continuously, you cannot get away from it, the people come to you with all kinds of sicknesses, and they imagine you can heal all kinds diseases—I remember once coming to a town where there was a man, one of our preachers, and he had been sick about three weeks when I came there. He looked to be almost a skeleton and I was really afraid for him. I asked him what he had been eating

and he said, "Why, I haven't eaten anything for two weeks," and that accounted for it. I asked him in regard to what medicine he had taken and he told me he had not taken any medicine. Well, I got hold of that man in that condition, and I examined him as thoroughly as I could, and finally I took one of my fowls and had his wife cook it and I had him eat it, and then I took some of my medicine that I had and gave it to him, and left some more with him, and to the surprise of my life, two days after, that man walked into the station thirty miles away. Now, it was not really the stuff I gave him so much as the soul, as it were, that was put into the man. He had something to eat, he had some medicine, and then he had some faith, as we will say. I think it is Professor Huxley that says it is a question of faith whether a man is healed. It is a question of faith, and why? It is not a question of whether a thing is true or not true, but it is a question of faith, whether a man believes it. And it seems to me that the question with Christian Science is whether the person believes it. If he believes it, he is healed, although I believe it is a lie.

Well, that man was healed. I remember another case when we were going around, and my wife was with me, and the people came to see us in quite large numbers, and quite a number were sick. They were given medicine; and by and by somebody came along and said, "This man's wife at the other town is very sick," and so we walked over there, a two-hours' journey, up and down hill and dale, until we arrived at that town. There we saw a tremendous crowd of people and the witch doctor was there carrying on his native incantations. Well, my wife went up there and she said, "I am *engonga*"—that is, she had been doing medical work—and so she went in and the witch doctor went out. She went over the case and saw the condition that woman was in, as far as we could judge by the books we had read and the practice we had had, and we decided that it was acute pneumonia. That woman was given something, she was spoken to, and medicine with proper directions was left with her, and she was healed.

So, I say, friends, I believe in psycho-therapeutics. I believe Jesus commissioned us to preach and teach and heal, and I believe also that a lot of the things that you are talking about that the

church ought to do, and the way to reach the masses, and a whole lot of those things, the missionaries are doing all the time on the foreign fields. Why? Because we are carrying out practically every injunction of our Lord Jesus Christ.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: The closing address will be delivered by Doctor Case, of Buffalo.

DR. CARL D. CASE:

I want to make a couple of distinctions only, and only speak three or four minutes, and the first is this: That as Jesus gave his command to teach and to preach and to heal, we understand by the gifts of the spirit in Paul's epistles that these gifts were varied and that one man had the gift of teaching and another man had the gift of healing.

I call your attention to the fact that there is a previous question to the one we have been discussing, and that is: What is the church? We have practically discussed that question before in this Congress; as to whether the New Testament teaches that the church is to be considered as an institution. Jesus gave his command to individuals and every doctor today who is healing the sick is fulfilling that command and we do not feel that psycho-therapeutics is the only method of healing the sick in obedience to Christ's command.

Now, the other thing I want to call your attention to is this: Professor Graham Taylor of Chicago Commons in this city was once asked what he regarded to be the function of the church and he said the function of the church was a threefold one: First, it must present the ideal of exalted life; second, the power of a self-sacrificing life; third, it furnishes the initiative for new social movements. I want you to notice the third phrase which is after all the question for consideration. The church has always furnished that initiative. You must remember that the kingdom of God is the end; that the church is but the means to the end. That there are these three great institutions, i. e., the family, the state, and the church, that are working toward that same goal.

In the early period of church history education seemed to be a function of the church. The monks were the teachers, but as history proceeded the state necessarily took up the function of

education, until today the church as a church assumes very little of its burden. Similarly in the line of healing, the church originally did all the hospital work and a part of the business of the church leaders was to visit the sick and render them necessary aid. But as the community has been more Christianized, this function has been turned over to other agencies, until today very few churches or Christian institutions do hospital work.

May it not be the same in the field of psycho-therapeutics? Some agency is needed to take the initiative. But, when the public have understood the necessity of psycho-therapeutics, then the church may turn aside from this function to other new fields of Christian endeavor.

We know that in the biological evolution of animals certain organs are atrophied by disuse and certain functions pass away on account of the change of environment. It is so with the church. The first two things mentioned by Professor Taylor are the permanent function of the church, to furnish a high ideal of Christian living, and the power of self-sacrificing devotion. As history proceeds and new environment will ever reach fresh duties, each temporary function will be succeeded by a new temporary function as the church leads civilization along Christian lines.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: This will close our session. I hope you will not forget we come together again at three o'clock this afternoon for the closing session. The general theme is "Christ's Prayer for Unity."

Closing prayer having been offered by Doctor Ames, an adjournment was taken until three o'clock P. M.

---

THIRD DAY

*Afternoon Session*

November 12, 1908

3 o'clock P. M.

DR. WILLETT: Will the Congress be in order? We will sing two or three stanzas of Hymn No. 1,003.

(The Congress joined in song.)



DR. WILLETT: Prayer will be offered by Dr. Earle of the Belden Avenue Baptist Church.

(Dr. Earle offered prayer.)

DR. WILLETT: We have come to the final session of this Congress and no theme could be more appropriate for this occasion than "Christ's Prayer for Unity." The first speaker upon this theme, representing the Free Baptist Church, is Rev. A. W. Jefferson, of Portland, Maine, who will now address you.

REV. A. W. JEFFERSON (Free Baptist), of Portland, Me., presented the following paper:

### CHRIST'S PRAYER FOR UNITY

In considering this great prayer of our Lord's one can appreciate the reverence shown by the German pietist, Spencer, who never chose a text from the seventeenth chapter of John because the passage best lends itself to devotional meditation. But if we understand the true nature of this prayer, it is the self-revelation of the mind of the Master, and must be reverently studied as a source of supreme authority. Christ's prayer life was, for the most part, spent in private devotion, yet there are a few critical moments when his pent-up spirit breaks the bonds of retirement and reveals the secrets of his fathomless nature. Such moments stand solitary in their sublimity. Our Master's previous discourse with his disciples concludes by passing up into communion with his God. With a vision, prophetic in its scope, and a love, divine in its embrace, he pleads that the ever-widening circle of believers may be bound with a triple bond, to himself, to each other, and to the world. His oneness with the Father furnished the type, his will and purpose, expressed in prayer, the motive, and the redemption of the world the grand result. In spite of crude conceptions, false interpretations, and serious errors in administration, the church has never entirely lost sight of this great ideal which the Master lifted before the discordant world.

As early as the time of the writing of the Didache, or not later than the middle of the second century, unity was a burning question demanding special prayer. In the ritual for the celebration of the Lord's Supper appear these significant petitions:

As this broken bread was scattered on the face of the mountains, and, gathered together, became one, even so may thy church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom. . . . Remember, Lord, thy church, to deliver it from all evil, and to perfect it in thy love, and gather it together from the four winds.

As prayers grow out of conscious needs, these petitions, embodied, as they were, in an established ritual, indicate an imminent peril confronting the infant church.

The ancient Catholic church was easily satisfied with a mere formal and external unity. It grew up in the midst of a great imperial empire, and almost unconsciously absorbed the political ideals which that empire lost in its decay. The old forms of tyranny survived in an ecclesiastical despotism which held the church to its papal center. Caesar had established a political imperialism which Charlemagne sought to perpetuate through his conquests, and Huldebrand in his dream of a Holy Roman empire. For centuries a mere form of unity secured by the Roman hierarchy satisfied Christendom. As a result of the Protestant Reformation the old artificial bonds of union were forever shattered. But the intense individualism which ran riot through the reformed churches was not suited to the work of reconstructing a united church. The points of emphasis fell on two phases of current thought, neither of which was vital enough to strike the discordant elements into even the semblance of harmony. Men began to think for themselves, and when men think for themselves they think about governing themselves and democracy is the result. The impulse which the Reformation gave to civil liberty expressed itself in the theocracy which John Calvin established in Geneva, and tended to raise mere matters of church administration to positions of major importance. In the free, plastic life of the apostolic church, adapting itself to new problems, customs, and races, the controversialist found the germ of almost any form of polity he chose to champion. These heated discussions introduced slight differences in church government as valid excuses for furthering the work of disruption.

The recognition of the right of private interpretation of the Scriptures sent the scholars back to their books, to study, criticize, and reconstruct the doctrines of the church. The Greek Fathers

had established the principles of religious philosophy; the Latin Fathers had outlined the great systems of doctrine; the Reformers made themselves masters of the art of creed making, but all too soon became the slaves of their own craft. Whatever virtues lie in the great historic creeds, and they are many, history clearly teaches that they are not foundations upon which to build a united church. No man or council of men have either the right or authority to fix the beliefs of a divine institution which, like the church, was founded for the purpose of giving free expression to an ever-growing religious thought and experience. The teachings of the gospel cannot be stated in a way to make them final. They spring from a seed and are ever expressing themselves in new leaf, bud, blossom, and flower. Dr. Clark opens his *Outlines of Christian Theology* with this statement, "Theology is preceded by religion, as botany by the life of the plants. Religion is the reality of which theology is the study." Christ founded his church on the reality. In Dr. Robertson's church at Brighton there is a memorial window representing Christ among the doctors of the law; beneath it is a tablet bearing this significant inscription, "They were thinking about theology; he was thinking about God." The logic of history makes it self-evident that Christ's purpose for his church can never be realized through insistence on anything less important than that vital religion which remains fixed in the midst of a changing order.

Our little systems have their day:  
They have their day and cease to be:  
They are but broken lights of Thee,  
And Thou, O Lord, art more than they.

If the past attempts to unify Christendom sound loud warnings, they need not occasion despair or discouragement. "Not failure but low aim is crime." The New Testament church, which has already received the attention of this Congress, offers the only practical solution of this problem. It is evident that at the beginning the *ecclesia* was the simplest form of a religious democracy. Christ planted the mustard seed of the kingdom and left its growth to the centuries; he hid a kernel deep in the soil of human nature; then like the patient husbandman waited for

"first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear." His supreme concern was not to organize a society, but to discover the human soul, and leave to it the creation of an institution through which it could find its highest expression. He would make high-souled men and send them forth to make a Church. As the Holy Spirit is sometimes used by the New Testament writers to designate the spirit of Christ continuing in the world, so the church is regarded as his visible body, the instrument through which the work of redemption is to be consummated. Paul has left a few classic passages in which this figure is employed. To think of dismembering that body and still having a church he looked upon as the height of absurdity. "Is Christ divided?" he asks of the contending Corinthians. Facing conditions which would shatter Protestantism into a thousand fragments he writes, "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord." The bond of union could not be a matter of temperament, for the church was composed of a heterogeneous company, representing all phases of tastes, talents, and beliefs. It could not be social, for beside the proud Pharisee stood the despised publican. It could not be doctrinal, for the age of creed making had not then begun. As President Faunce has aptly said, "The unity was that of one Lord, not yet psychologically analyzed, one faith not yet metaphysically formulated, one baptism not yet etymologically discussed." It was a common experience of redemption, and a mutual recognition of the lordship of Jesus which bound the church into a spiritual and visible whole. Paul dared to carry this broad principle to its logical and Christian conclusion. "Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth; for God hath received him. . . . Wherefore receive ye one another, as Christ also received us to the glory of God." Dr. Sanday commenting on these passages reminds us that Paul here declares the high principle that all whom Christ has received should, without any distinction, be accepted into his church. Or to use Cyprian's noble phrase, "The church is the mother of all of whom God is the father." To break fellowship with one of Christ's most humble and immature disciples is to break fellowship with him. Thus

in the midst of a narrow and provincial age Paul lifted a standard toward which the Christian centuries have raised but lame hands.

Christ's prayer calls for a type of union which will make its imprint on the world. Not some form which will satisfy the church, but which will convince the world, a world devoid of spiritual discernment. Granting that the church is now one in spirit, it must not be a disembodied spirit if it would fulfil the Lord's command. "*As thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.*" Here is a condition within the church which must be realized before she can proclaim her evangel with convincing power and authority. More convincing than philosophical speculations, than decrees of ecumenical councils, or the pious homilies of the mystics is a united body of believers of whom the world must say, "Behold how they love one another." Here is the one irresistible apologetic with which to face and convince a doubting world. The disciple who listened to this prayer with the clearest spiritual discernment never lost sight of its meaning. Jerome is responsible for the tradition that toward the end of John's life, when he was so weak that they carried him to the church to preach, he used often to say no more than this, "Little children, love one another." His friends were wearied of this and said, "Master, why dost thou always say this?" To which he replied, "It is the Lord's command, and if this alone is done, it is enough."

The prayer moves on to the second result which must follow the union of believers. "*I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me.*" The purpose expressed in vs. 21 was to convince the world that Christ was sent of God; now it is that the world may *know* that God not only sent Christ, but loves the world even as he loves Christ. The world must first be convinced and then evangelized. It is not surprising that the awakening interest in missions, the new evangelistic impulse, and the deepening interest in the question of union should appear together, for they are parts of the same spiritual quickening. Jesus makes the world's belief in his divine origin and mission, as well as its conception of divine love, depend on the previous existence of a church "made perfect in

one." Many have been the attempts in the past to evangelize the unchurched. The Franciscan monks drove their converts to the baptismal fonts at the point of the spear; the Reformers gave their message with a diversity which would tempt every form of taste and thought; the Puritans filled their rude meeting-houses by the help of the blue laws; while the church of today taxes her ingenuity to devise some new attraction with which to woo the world. Is it not time, high time, to give way to the Master's method—close ranks and win the kingdom?

This prayer raises so high the standard that from every side comes the cry, "It is too high; we cannot attain unto it." But happily Christ is not only the "truth and the light" but also the "way." He lifts the standard, prophesies the victory, and bestows the power. *"And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them, that they may be one, even as we are one."* The glory which Christ received from God when it is transmitted to the church will strike it into harmony. There are few words in the New Testament more common than glory, few more difficult of definition. Chrysostom interprets it in this passage as meaning the glory of the signs and of the doctrine and of the unity of spirit. Augustine makes it the glory of immortality which human nature was to receive in Christ. John Calvin defines it as the image of God, which, revealed through Christ, begets a new spiritual life in the hearts of believers. This last interpretation states the truth most clearly. To glorify means to interpret, to manifest, and make intelligible. Bosworth glorified Johnson by revealing the true character of his hero. Ruskin glorified the all-but-forgotten Turner by making intelligible the hidden genius of that great artist. Christ glorified God by making him manifest to the church; the church glorifies the Father and his only begotten Son by making them intelligible to the world. Professor Drummond puts it in a nutshell:

The word has many meanings; in ethics it can have but one. Glory is *character*, nothing less, and it can be nothing more. The earth is "full of the glory of the Lord" because it is full of his character. The "beauty of the Lord" is character. . . . "The Glory of the Only Begotten" is character, the character which is fulness of grace and

truth. . . . We all reflect as a mirror the character of Christ, are transformed into the same image from character to character.

The glory which is to unify the church is Christian character. When an intelligent, broad, and deeply spiritual type of character is evolved then church federation, co-operation, and organic union will follow as naturally as the meadow brook flows from the hillside spring. In the clear light of this great high-priestly prayer the path of present duty is made plain. The door has been opened and no man can shut it. The standard has been lifted and no power can lower it. The command has gone forth from lips divine and no church of the living God can disobey it.

During one of the fierce battles of the Civil War a young color-bearer ran before the advancing line and planted the colors on the ramparts. The colonel seeing his danger ordered him back to the line, but disregarding military discipline, he cried, "Bring the line up to the colors." Jesus Christ has planted the colors before the advancing line of the church militant; timid souls ask him to bring the colors back to the line; he orders the church up to the colors.

DR. WILLETT: The second paper, representing the Disciples, is by Rev. Vernon Stauffer, Angola, Ind.

REV. VERNON STAUFFER then read the following paper:

#### CHRIST'S PRAYER FOR UNITY

In the upper room in Jerusalem, just before the betrayal, a few hours only before the crucifixion, Jesus prayed. Every circumstance conspired to make the prayer express the full flood of his soul's deep yearnings. His "hour" had come. He had so nearly completed the work which his Father had given him to do that he conceived of it as already accomplished. He had glorified God on the earth. Another day would see the burden of responsibility for the world's redemption transferred from his heart to the hearts of his disciples. How would they bear it? To what end, at their hands, would come all his sacrificial planning and his holy hopes for humanity? Would his servants—his friends—prove true? Would they reincarnate his spirit? Would they perpetuate his redemptive ministry and fill up that which was behind of his

afflictions, through the self-denying ministries of their own lives? Would disaster, in the shape of worldliness or discord, overtake his cause? Would the little leaven of sanctified human nature, which he was leaving in the world, be able, by the grace of the gospel, to leaven the whole lump of humanity and, in the end, gather up all things unto himself? Clearly, it was an hour for communion with God, an hour for prayer that these who were his own in the world, whom he had loved and whom he continued to love unto the end, might be equal to the responsibility, might be able to complete that which he had begun, and so bring his cause to universal beneficence and triumph. And as that prayer rises, as one has said, "like some celestial music, through all the interwoven notes of different fellowships, the fellowship of the Father with the Son, the fellowship of the Master with the disciples, the fellowship of the disciples with each other," we are permitted, shall I not say, to press farther back into the region of Christ's own soul than through any other words that ever fell from his lips.

The heart of the prayer is reached in his petition that his disciples who then were present with him and those, also, who should afterward believe upon him through their word might "be one." Not that his spirit does not truly unburden itself in the petitions that his Father should again invest him with the eternal glory of which he had emptied himself when he took the form of a servant, and that at last all who had been given to him might be with him to behold the glory to which his Father had appointed him; but, since his mission to the world was primarily and essentially redemptive, that which affected this, which would bring the world to faith in him as its Redeemer, must have been that which filled the most central deeps of his soul. To this end had he been born, and for this cause came he into the world, to bear witness unto the truth, and through this witnessing, in life as well as in death, to restore men to the fellowship of the sons of God. This was his central message and this his sustaining consolation when he passed to his cross, and humiliation and anguish girt him on every side. By the logic of his redemptive mission, therefore, as well as by the logic of all the occasions for solicitude which were gathered up into the yearnings of that holy hour,



this petition for unity constitutes the heart of the Savior's prayer.

1. In the interpretation of that petition we notice, first, its distinct humanistic interest and concern. He prayed that his disciples might be one—to what end? Because he would save his cause from the reproach of discord and unlovely strife? No, not primarily. For the sake of the exaltation of the church? Assuredly not that. Nay, he prayed that “they may all be one that the world may believe” (to quote his own words), “that the world may know that thou didst send me, and lovedst them, even as thou lovedst me.” Here, as always, his interest was not theological, it was not ecclesiastical, it was not even doctrinal (surely not in the narrow sense of that word), much less was it metaphysical; it was practical, philanthropic, evangelical, steeped in his master missionary passion. “For *their* sakes,” not for the sake of ritual or dogma or tradition, he consecrated himself. With him the needs, the rights, of manhood came first. Out of his boundless, inexhaustible love for men, his compassionate yearning for their redemption, he prays this prayer. The Christ who defined his life-mission in the simple words: “The Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost;” who entered into the synagogue where a crowd of pious worshipers “were stupidly missing the whole secret of life and doing it in the name of religion,” and where, laying hold of a magnificent passage in their sacred literature, which to those dull worshipers had become a “dead letter,” but into which he breathed again the breath of a throbbing life, he affirmed as the proof of his sonship and his lordship: “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor: he hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord.” The Christ who urged with almost impatient earnestness that even such hoary, venerated institutions as the Sabbath were made for man, and not, as the punctilious, passionless, Pharisaic spirit had it, that man was made for them; the same Christ who proclaimed that it was more profitable for a man that a great mill-stone should be hanged about his neck and that he should be sunk in the depths of the sea, rather than to cause one of the little ones that believe upon him to stumble,

he it was who prayed this prayer. Does it not seem as though there in the upper room, as he prayed to his Father, everything else in the world faded from his memory save the faces of men? What a holy, humane longing was his! Not that reproach would stain his fair cause if division and discord should come, but that men would die in unbelief and therefore lose the heritage which he purchased for them—that was the thing, one might almost venture to affirm, the *only* thing, that moved him fervently to ask God that his disciples might be one.

What, may I ask, in all these days wherein we are speaking so eloquently of the desirability of Christian union, do we know about this? And what, may I ask, dare we hope for in the way of healing the hurt of division, until we begin truly to share with Jesus Christ in his supreme longing and compassion for men? Is not this the missing note, the lost chord? Think of it! Even at this late day, when it might fairly be supposed that the Christian world had grown utterly sick of elaborating definitions, of analyzing theories, of resolving and settling opinions, one hears with dismay the vociferous protest, in certain quarters, that all this talk about Christian union only marks a decadence of religious conviction. "Is it a movement toward Christ, or away from Christ?" we are being asked. Men are saying (some men are saying; thank God, not many are saying it): "Is it a movement toward a more rigid adherence to the principles taught and the practices inculcated in the word of Christ; or is it toward a more tolerant spirit, toward the principles and the forms of the loosest among those who call themselves Christians?" The principles taught and the practices inculcated in the word of Christ! In Heaven's name, what were those principles and those practices? Was there anything deeper, anything more fundamental in his principles than this: "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even these least, ye did it unto me"? And is there anything clearer, anything more conspicuous about his personal practice than that he would not break a bruised reed, nor quench a smoking flax? Consider how he declared himself with reference to those Jewish rulers who cast out of the synagogue the man who had been healed of his blindness. In the interests of dogma, to preserve intact their traditional, conventional orthodoxy, without a qualm of con-

science, they cast him out. He might rot in body and be damned in spirit for aught they cared. "Must not the doctrine be preserved?" Yes, yes; but is the love of truth alone the touchstone of religion? Hear the stern, terrible, overwhelming words of the Master as he pronounces the condemnation of those false shepherds: "thieves," "robbers," "hirelings"! Was Phillips Brooks right when he said: "The love of truth *alone* is cruel"? Divorced from the humane spirit, what fanaticism has it not fostered, what schisms has it not produced, of what wanton disregard for the rights of manhood has it not been guilty? In the great Shanghai Conference, held in China in 1907, one of the speakers, Dr. Gibson, gave this apologue: "I went out in the mists of the early morning, and saw a tiger. When it came nearer I saw it was a man; and when it came close, I found it was *my brother!*" Oh, my brothers, what can we need more today to spur the lagging cause of Christian union, than to "put on, as God's elect, a heart of compassion"? The sense of kinship will come with the sense of a consuming, Christ-like service. A church succoring and defending the weak will come to unity a thousand-fold more quickly than a church defending the faith. The real problem is not a problem of method, of adjustments and readjustments; it is a problem of consecration, of sanctification. Here, as elsewhere, Christ is himself the way. To enter into his compassion, to have fellowship with him in his sufferings, to have written over the tablet of every Christian's heart his words: "For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they themselves also may be sanctified in truth"—that would dissipate the obstacles which hinder the answer to the Savior's prayer, it would supply the momentum needed in our present snail-like motion toward the goal toward which we have set our faces, but not yet resolutely.

The testimony of the great modern mission fields confirms the statement. It is there, and not here in America where we hold polite conferences and make pretty speeches on Christian union, and sing with great gusto:

We are not divided,  
All one body we—

but never seem really to get to anything more tangible than the

making of the speeches and the singing of the song. It is there, I say, and not here, that denominational Christianity is actually fading away; it is there in the Orient that there is being ushered in, with a rapidity that shames us, a new day wherein the instinct of solidarity, the sense of fraternity among all Christians is being felt irresistibly strong. That result represents an inevitable reaction. In the conscious presence of a debased, degraded, ruined humanity the church of the Orient is reincarnating the spirit of her Lord; she is sharing generously in his compassion, and therefore in the fellowship of all who love the Lord. In the white flame of that intense missionary passion denominational differences and schismatic tendencies are being consumed. One in devotion, they become one in life. Is it not high time we were learning the lesson? Much as I rejoice in this occasion, highly honored as I feel to stand in this presence, I do not hesitate to say that the cause of Christian unity has far more to hope for from those influences and tendencies within the church which today are making so strongly for a passionate love for humanity and an agonizing ministry of intercession and service on behalf of its redemption, than in all the formal conferences which have been held, or which may be held, in the interests of a larger and a richer fellowship in Christ. It is the "man willing to die who becomes the master of the world." By the same token, it is the church which, in its yearning for unity, finds its inspiration, not in a concern to conserve its economic interests, nor in the lust for power, nor yet in the supreme desire to remove the scandal of division, but rather in the greatness and the insistency of its longing for the salvation of the world; it is such a church as this that comes to feel itself one with the Father and with the Savior and with all who love the Lord. Wherefore let our fervent prayer be:

Lord, make me one with Thine own faithful ones,  
Thy saints who love Thee and are loved by Thee,  
Till the day break and till the shadows flee.  
At one with them in alms and orisons;  
At one with him who toils and him who runs,  
And him who yearns for union yet to be;  
At one with all who throng the crystal sea,  
And wait the setting of our moons and suns.

2. We notice, secondly, the *nature of the unity for which Christ prayed*. Was it organic and vital; or was it a mere oneness of feeling and desire? Was it in the mind and heart of our Lord that it should manifest itself openly, legibly, objectively to the world? Before we venture to give our answer to the question, let us once more attempt to interpret the mind of the Master. These were his words: "Neither for these only do I pray, but for them also that believe upon me through their word; that they all may be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us: that the world may believe that thou didst send me." And then, as though his mind could not free itself from the thought, so supremely significant it seemed to him, he continued: "That they may be one, even as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one; that the world may know that thou didst send me, and lovedst them, even as thou lovedst me." Mark well those phrases: "One as we are one;" "perfected into one;" "that the world may believe;" "that the world may know." Spiritual unity? Yes, assuredly: one in Christ and in God. Organic unity? Beyond all peradventure. The world is to come to its faith in the saviorhood and the lordship of Jesus through the clear and impressive witness it bears. Why try to separate the two, any more than to try to separate the letter and the spirit of the gospel? Is not the one the mold within which the other is contained? Did Paul have the mind of Christ, or spake he only as men speak, when he wrote his immortal analogy:

For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; it is not therefore not of the body. And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; it is not therefore not of the body. If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling? But now hath God set the members each one of them in the body, even as it pleased Him. And if they were all one member, where were the body? But now they are many members, but one body. And the eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee: or again

the head to the feet, I have no need of you. Nay, much rather, those members of the body which seem to be more feeble are necessary: and those parts of the body, which we think to be less honorable, upon these we bestow more abundant honor; and our uncomely parts have more abundant comeliness; whereas our comely parts have no need: but God tempered the body together, giving more abundant honor to that part which lacked; that there should be no schism in the body [mark the words!]; but that the members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffereth, all the members suffer with it; or one member is honored, all the members rejoice with it. Now ye are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof.

The quotation is long, I grant you; but it is the pure word of the Lord, is it not? The body of a man, with all its various organs, performing each their various functions, yet tempered together into one body, wherein there is no schism, animated by one spirit, constituting through the one body and the one spirit—*one life*. How utterly foolish, alongside of that superb conception, sounds the statement of one of the most familiar of the modern ideals of Christian fellowship—a bundle of sticks tied together for the sake of mutual self-preservation, capable of being broken if the sticks are taken separately, but resisting every pressure if they are bound together. “A body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, . . . according to the working in due measure of each several part,” *versus* a bundle of sticks! To what base uses may not a divine ideal come! Would it seem amiss to quote here Bacon’s observation in the *Advancement of Learning*?

The interpretations of the Scriptures are of two sorts—methodical and solute, or at large. For this divine water . . . either is first forced up into a cistern, and from thence fetched and derived for use, or else it is drawn and received in buckets and vessels immediately where it springeth. The former part whereof it seems to be the more ready, yet in my judgment is more subject to corrupt.

Quaint metaphor that: “Forcing the divine water up into a cistern, and from thence fetching it and deriving it for use,” but wherein has it not been fully warranted with respect to the subject now under discussion? Up into the cistern of the denominational conception of Christianity have the divine waters of New

Testament Christianity been forced, and from the corrupted waters of that cistern we have been fetching and deriving the ideas which go to bolster up a conception of the church which represents the very antithesis of the ideal of the Scriptures: one body, one spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all.

Yes, let us begin to say it with emphasis and without equivocation, no matter what rebukes it administers, no matter what traditions it overturns, no matter what shibboleths it repudiates, nor what creeds and party standards it flings into the dust: Jesus Christ meant a unity visible and invisible, vital and external, organic and spiritual, outward as well as inward. The world was to see it and to feel it and to be convinced by it. Because of it, where every other appeal failed, the unbelieving world was to respond to the challenge of Jesus: "Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me: or else believe me for the very work's sake." What else can his words mean: "That they may be perfected into one that the world may know that thou didst send me, and lovedst them, even as thou lovedst Me"? All too long we have been making our apologies and drawing out our fine distinctions between "spiritual unity" and "structural unity," between "an invisible oneness" and "an incidental non-conformity." The world mocks at the apologies, and confesses itself hopelessly muddled over the fine distinctions. With entire appropriateness did Dr. Goodchild represent that skeptical, scoffing world standing, listening to our vociferous affirmations that we are not divided, and answering with Emerson: "What you do speaks so loud that I cannot hear what you say?"

Are the words with which Principal Fairbairn closed his magnificent volume on *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology* too hard for us to hear?

It were to affirm no paradox, but rather a position capable of the clearest historical proof [said he], were we to maintain that the higher the theory of the church the meaner the conception of God, or that the growth of high church doctrine is always coincident with the decay of the highest theistic belief. For an absolute or infallible church means a limited God, a God whose working men condition, whose mercies they circumscribe, whose grace they regulate and distribute. Their limita-

tions are imposed on him; his attributes are not transmuted into their energies. They but repeat on a larger scale the sin of Israel—God belongs to their church rather than their church to God. . . . For the more worthily churches think of God, the more will they feel the fallibility of their popes and pastors; the more they are possessed with the faith of his sufficiency, the less will they build on the idea of their own; the more infinitely good and gracious he seems, the less will they be able to claim to be his sole and adequate representatives. The virtue of a church does not differ from the virtue of a man: all are but earthen vessels, even though they be vessels that bear the treasure of the Lord.

From this unworthy, ignoble love of church (I speak not of the body of the Lord) God grant we may be speedily delivered! To the passion of bringing a lost world to faith in Christ, God grant we may be as speedily and effectually committed!

3. Of the bearing of this divine prayer for unity upon the important and inviting theme of the authority of Christ, all this I pass over in silence, that I may come in the last few moments allotted to me to the plain and impressive implication of the passage with respect to the office of prayer in bringing about the consummation for which the Master himself prayed. We go back again to that sacred presence-chamber. The heart of the great Master is burdened for the welfare of his kingdom after he shall have passed into the heavens. As nothing else, he fears the danger of schism. Above everything else, he desires that his church may be preserved in perfect unity. And what does he do? Does he talk with his disciples about it, earnestly admonishing them, laying down for them a programme marking out for them a method? Nay, he meets the great subject with prayer! For him, our Lord and Master, this is the first thing, the most immediate duty, the most practical and effective method by which to attain to the desired result. He has given us an example. Oh, for the fulness of faith, the completeness of devotion, to apprehend its tremendous import! Shall we say it today:

Hushed be the noise and the strife of the schools,  
Volume and pamphlet, sermon and speech,  
The lips of the wise and the prattle of fools:  
Let the Son of man teach!



Who has the key of the future but He?  
 Who can unravel the knots of the skein?  
 We have groaned and have travailed and sought to be free:  
 We have travailed in vain!  
 Bewildered, dejected, and prone to despair,  
 To Him, as at first, do we turn and beseech.  
 Our ears are all open: "Give heed to our prayer!  
 O Son of man, teach!"

Ah, he will give heed soon enough when we are ready for the lesson. And has not the time now fully come for us to turn to him and let him show us the way to do the thing which we desire but know how to bring to pass? Despite all the methods we have tried—fraternal conferences, campaigns of union evangelism, the federation of churches, the exchange of pulpits—none will deny that the movement toward unity still waits for the really powerful impulse that shall give it irresistible momentum and speedily carry it forward to a triumphant issue. In view of that which Jesus did in the upper room, it were well worth while for us to consider whether prayer, secret, individual, congregational, universal prayer, is not now the church's first great duty and resource. "In the last analysis the source of power of any spiritual movement is God, and the energies of God are released in answer to prayer." More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of. If the whole church, feeling at least in some small sense the necessity of unity as Christ felt it, should give itself to prayer, to prayer as a passion, as an entreaty, as the utter engulfment of the will in the great achievement, prayer that fulfils Coleridge's conception:

An affirmation and an act  
 That bids eternal truth be fact!

who shall say what blessed results might not quickly follow? Where is the ministry of prayer on this behalf magnified as it ought to be? Where are the strong cryings and tears? Where are the ceaseless supplications and the blood-sweat intercessions? It is our shame that we are leaving to the last that which by divine precept and example ought to have come first. Brethren and fathers! The cause of Christian unity drags itself painfully

forward today because the church is not possessed by the spirit of prayer on behalf of the great end! In the last analysis, Christian unity will come, as every work of God comes, not by might, nor by power, but by the Spirit of the Lord. To have the mind of Christ is to make the solution of the problem immediately inevitable. Somehow, in some way, we must see to it that there is lifted upon the soul of every follower of Christ the vision of that scene in the upper room: the Master in the midst of his disciples, praying with impassioned yearning that all who believe in him may be one that the world may know that God sent him into the world and loves the world even as he is loved of God. Thrilled by that vision the church will enter upon a ministry of supplication and intercession because of which it shall see the travail of its soul, and be satisfied!

DR. WILLETT: The third of the three papers representing the Baptists will be read by Rev. Henry M. Sanders, of New York.

REV. HENRY M. SANDERS, D.D., presented the following paper:

#### CHRIST'S PRAYER FOR UNITY

The intercessory prayer of our Lord, recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John's Gospel, is, in some respects, the most precious utterance that ever fell from his lips. We have in it the words which Christ addressed to God in the critical hour of his life—words in which he uttered the deepest thought and feeling of his heart concentrated and clarified by the prospect of his approaching death. Even among the prayers of Christ this stands by itself as that in which he gathered up the retrospect of his past, and surveyed the future of his kingdom; in which, as if already dying, he solemnly presented to the Father himself, his work and his people. Realizing the solemnity of the occasion, we may say with Melancthon, "There is no voice which has ever been heard, either in heaven or on earth, more exalted, more holy, more sublime, more fruitful than this prayer offered by the Son of God." It is toward the close of the prayer that he offers the petition for the unity of his disciples.

It is suggestive to find this thought of the unity of his people

almost the last that occupied the mind of the Master before his passion, as if it were the heaviest burden pressing on his heart. A kind of fear concerning the future of his disciples seems to have oppressed him. He knew he was leaving them under circumstances which might scatter them like sheep. He knew the twelve men so well in the varieties of their temperaments and the frailties of their natures. He had often found it necessary to rebuke and repress envyings and rivalries among them, and these might break out again. Peter, the impulsive and outspoken, James, the self-assertive, Thomas, the doubter, might soon come to misunderstand each other. Some trifling root of bitterness might easily spring up, causing difference and dissension. He knew their slowness of spiritual apprehension, their ignorance of the comprehensive character of the kingdom he came to establish; the temptation to pride and jealousy, the self-seeking which had been so manifest in them during his ministry, quarreling so often as to preference and precedence and chief seats.

Well may he have prayed for that sanctifying grace which would keep them in loving fellowship. And looking out on the world and the work he was intrusting to them, Jesus felt the importance of their unity. That alone would give power to their testimony concerning him. Out of the mouths of concerted witnesses would every word be established. A threefold cord is not easily broken. If his disciples but held together, testifying the same truths, maintaining a loving harmony of spirit, they would prove a persuasive power to the whole world of his divine claims and mission. And so he offers this prayer for their unity.

And what kind of unity is it that he seeks for his disciples? "That they may be one even as we are." Whatever the analogy means it refers evidently to an association that is very close and intimate. How far our Lord, when he spoke these words, had in mind the mysterious plurality, yet essential unity of the God-head, it is not easy to say. Certainly a number of independent beings can never be one in exactly the same sense that God is one. Yet something more seems to be implied than mere harmony of spirit and sentiment, something akin to organic unity, in which every part is quick with the same vital force. So he said a little while before, "I am the vine, ye are the branches." So Paul

said of himself, "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." Whatever the relation between the Father and the Son consists in, it is manifest that the unity between them is inward, essential, vital, organic. They are one in feeling, counsel, action, name. The same acts are ascribed to both, the same purposes are formed by both. The same names are used of both. So in some manner, to some degree, at least, is it to be with those who believe on his name. In some way his life is blended with ours and fashions it to the same holy ends. This unity can only be expressed in terms of personality. This is the unity of which he speaks, for which he prays, an inner unity brought out of the mysterious communication of his life with ours, of his person with ours, by which they all inhere and cohere, as in the human body, which is used in Scripture to illustrate it, by bone and joint, sinew and ligament, building up the full stature of a man in Christ. "He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit."

So Christian union has its originating impulse and continued inspiration in the Christian's union with God. It thus belongs to the deepest reality of the Christian life. Oneness with God and oneness with one another spring from the same source. Christian life is fellowship in its innermost meaning, fellowship with God and fellowship with man. The love which unites Christians with one another is the reality and result of the love which unites them to God. "And this commandment have we from him that he that loveth God, loveth his brother also." This fellowship of Christian hearts underlies and constitutes the visible church, which is primarily an assembly of Christians called out and met together to express and maintain and perfect the living communion of the soul with God and with one another. As such the church is manifold. There are various assemblies, many churches, according to the various localities in which they are gathered together. In the New Testament more frequent reference is made to these individual assemblies than to the general fellowship in which they are all participants. But we find in close connection references to the "church of God" and "churches of God" (1 Cor. 10:32; 11:16). Christ is the "head of the church" (Eph. 5:23); it is "the church of the Living God" (1 Tim. 3:15) and there are also "churches of Christ" (Rom. 16:16), and "churches of the

saints" (I Cor. 14:33). The unity and plurality are distinctly marked and neither was to the prejudice of the other.

The unity of the Spiritual Church now exists and has always existed. It underlies all differences. It constitutes the church invisible. That spiritual body of which Christ is the head, between whom there is community of thought, experience, purpose, movement—in a word, life. This body is independent of conditions of time and place and form. It has no outward organization. It has never been "constituted." Its condition of membership is not baptism but faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; its roster those whose names are written in the Lamb's Book of Life. Its sessions are not convened in any material structure but are held by those who sit in the heavenlies in Christ Jesus. Its baptism is not that of water but of the Holy Spirit; its communion not partaking of earthly bread and wine but feeding upon the Living Bread which came down from heaven. It has its polity, liturgy, discipline, but they are all spiritual. So you can take away creed, ceremony, muster-roll, building, polity, minister, all such, and you have taken away only what is formal, incidental, transient. The church of the Living God, which is the pillar and ground of truth, still survives in all the essentials of her divine nature. This is the church of the First Born, the corporation of regenerated spirits, the body of Christ—the Kingdom of God. This is the church invisible, indivisible, universal, immortal, ideal, indestructible, against which the gates of hell cannot prevail. This church is one, absolute and complete, and always has been and always will be.

Such being the unity of the spiritual church does it not follow that we ought forever to strive to realize this unity in outward fact, in the churches organized by men on earth? Ought not the church of man and the church of Christ, the church organized and the church organic, the church of manner and the church of matter, the church of form and the church of life to be coincident? As a thought craves a word by which to utter itself as a man's spirit demands a body in which to actualize itself, as the will hungers for an act in which to liberate itself, so this inner spiritual unity demands of necessity an actual embodiment, visible, concrete, organic.

And what do we really behold? The church of God divided, distorted, distracted, all mangled, torn, and broken. She is indeed the church militant, but it is largely internecine strife. Instead of working against the world-rulers of darkness and spiritual hosts of wickedness in high places, she wars against her own flesh and blood, making schism in her own body, tearing herself limb from limb. See her manifold and bitter divisions and subdivisions, sects and insects, for many of them are as pestiferous as they are small and insignificant; her clashing creeds, politics, and schools; all shrieking their various discordant shibboleths "I am of Paul;" "I am of Apollos;" "I am of Cephas;" "I am of Calvin;" "I am of Luther;" "I am of Wesley," thus proving by the apostle's rebuke and stigma their carnality and not their spirituality, their infantile weakness and not their manly strength, as they go on emphasizing divisions and glorying in them, and justifying them, insisting that they are all of the Lord whereas many of them are of the very devil. Can anyone in his senses believe that the present condition of Christendom is pleasing to Christ and in accordance with his mind and prayer? Who does not feel that our separations and sectarianism and alienations are most deplorable and disastrous? Who is not infinitely weary of the old acrimonious battles over jots and tittles, iotas and prepositions; tithing mint, anise, and cummin and forgetting the weightier matters of the law, to say nothing of the gospel? Who is not disgusted at the zeal to proselyte that is out of all proportion to the zeal to Christianize? Who that knows his New Testament does not see that heresy there (*aipeous*) does not mean aberration of opinion but the recklessness of faction and that therefore the worst of all heresies is the heresy of hatred, that *odium*, which to our eternal shame has acquired the distinctive title, "theologicum." And all the while that we are disputing and wrangling about the uncertain, and almost always about the infinitely unimportant, the enemy is at our gates. For,

A town at war  
To manage private, and domestic quarrels,  
'Tis monstrous!

Is it any wonder then, that Christians of every name are conceiving a fresh repugnance against our divided state and a great

disgust at our petty, parochial partisanship? that they are determined seriously and earnestly to examine anew the reasons which have been supposed to justify this religious anarchy, in order to bring about a more sensible ordering of our Christianity; and at whatever cost of sentiment, of self-importance, of vested interests, set themselves to the task of recovering the lost ideal and restoring that unity which the Master designed to be proof to the world of his divine character and mission?

If you want to know all that the church misses by her divisions, notice the blessings which Christ specifies in this prayer, as accompanying perfect unity. They are three: (1) "The glory which Thou gavest me I have given them, that they may be one even as we are." The glory! What is that? It is the blessing that lies like the sunlight of a mighty consecration, hallowing, assuring, uplifting, inspiring; the supernal splendor which shines down when the heavens are clear; the calm delight in the consciousness that God is with us; the authentic sanction which accompanies the proclamation of the good news; the tokens of divine favor "as the smell of a field that the Lord had blessed;" high festival days of power and triumph. Doubt, fear, hesitation all gone! It is all so clear that God has uttered his voice, that he has brought forth judgment unto victory. That is the glory which would attend unity, and without which we plod wearily along, doing our work in a mechanical, listless way, laboring at a disadvantage, with powers checked, with no clarion peal to guide the moving host, no clear voice ringing out at critical moments, "This is the way, walk ye in it." We push on stumbling, startled, timid, unsteady, with no sure message, no explicit sanction, no good cheer, no outburst of song, no glad approval. Oh! do we not know it, alas! all too well in our churches today? Is that not just our condition—the timid faith that is not sure of its steps. The cheerless groping, the dull and blind plodding along? It is not that we have not much, but we have not the "glory," the power of the Holy Ghost, the abundant life, the full assurance, the joy of the Lord which is our strength, the glow and the gladness of service. Our work and our testimony have not the sure presence, the visible and authentic blessing which would come to a united Christendom.

(2) And another loss we are warned to expect is "perfection." "I in Thee and Thou in me that they may be made perfect in one." Complete unity of Christians would be a life of association, of mutual interchange of gifts, the compactness of the whole by that which every part supplieth making for the increase of the body into the building up itself in love." Each would be raised to full power by its combination with the rest. "That they without us should not be made perfect." In union there is perfection as well as strength. There would be an immense enrichment of the Christian life by the united church appropriating the best things that belonged to each contributing sect, as shown in all our hymn-books, where are Roman Catholic, Unitarian, Calvinistic, and Armenian hymns, which we all sing in sweet unconsciousness of their being anything but Christian. In our divided condition there is something one-sided, partial, meager, dwarfed, and dwindled about any one denomination. Each bears the mark of incompleteness. It may toil away but it brings forth no fruit unto perfection. Each lacks something which another can give. Each one possesses some characteristic which would add charm and efficiency to every other one. Alone, separated, segregated, however many and promising the signs of life, however much and vigorous the efforts made, yet all disappointing, missing fruition, falling short of completeness, the reason for which is found in this prayer, "that they may all be perfect in one."

(3) And we know well the third loss we must expect as long as Christians are divided as they are. It is given in the prayer, "that the world may know that thou hast sent me." Unity gauges the measure of our power to convert the world to Christ. If all Christians were gathered into an ordered combination of manifold gifts, if only they were welded into an organized host, cohesive, compact, and not a mere ragged mob, often a wild and quarrelsome mob, rushing along in rough disorder, Oh! what a power and persuasion would be ours, what conviction would we work, what might we would exert for the pulling down of strongholds! We are finding today, as never before, that the church has a work to do that demands that we stand together. You can't hit a target with a hand full of sawdust. A rock that needs fifty men to move it cannot be budged if only five men go at it at a time. When a



man wants to strike a blow that will be effective he concentrates his fingers into a good, hard fist. We have been fighting Satan now these many years with an open hand, with our denominational fingers all foolishly distended, and we have made comparatively little impression. What a waste of men and money spent on rearing and maintaining our denominational barriers, which are like fences in a crude stage of social evolution. They grow no crops. No wheat ripens on stone walls but only deadly nightshade and poisoned ivy. What labor they represent that might have gone into breadstuffs, to say nothing of the fact that they are not things of beauty but joylessnesses forever. Is it anything surprising that sensible men, seeing the folly, the waste, the uselessness of these barriers, are determined that as far and as fast as possible they shall be demolished that the fields may yield a wider and a whiter harvest? With a reunited church that competition of sects which, in our smaller communities, is often such a scandal, would cease; all missionary enterprises, especially in heathen lands, would receive a fresh impetus. In the presence of whole nations which are to be won to Christ, the divisions of Christendom are a disheartening spectacle and a disgrace. Our denominational differences seem very trivial, for instance, in India, where 200,000,000 people worship a cow! The consciousness of union would have a peculiarly enlarging and inspiring effect. A new thrill of life and joy, a new sense of power and hope would come to all. Unbelieving multitudes would feel it, the cavilings of critics would be silenced, the barriers of paganism be overthrown and the world lie conquered at the feet of Christ.

Thus, according to our Lord's prayer, the threefold loss which we experience while we are divided as we are, is the "glory," the "perfection" and the "victory." The inner unity will still exist, promise and presage of outward unity, which knits all believers into Christ and baptizes them into one Spirit, but it will be without marked signals of divine favor, without the crowning gifts, without complete conquest. The full sunlight will fall sparsely, the perfection come rarely, and the victories be few and partial, while the world—the solid, massive, wicked world, so fierce and so defiant, so stubborn and so unyielding—will remain unconverted to Christ.

It is not within the scope of my purpose to consider the practical steps by which reunion can be attained. If history and experience teach us anything it is that it cannot be brought about by coercion, by proselyting and persecution. The root of that theory lies in the claim to exclusive monopoly of spiritual authority vested in one particular form of ecclesiastical organization. The irreducible demand of such, however courteously expressed, must be the conditional surrender on the part of all the others. But this method has been discredited by experience, has met with dire and dismal failure. It has been abundantly tried, not for a few years but for successive generations. Europe was devastated by religious wars; multitudes perished on the scaffold, at the stake, in dungeons, under hideous torture, and as a result of all this vast accumulation of suffering, scandal, and crime, the grand object of uniting Christendom was not only not secured, but was made immensely more difficult. For one convert thus made, a hundred were alienated. That policy of coercion is futile. Nor can it be secured by absorption, by comprehension, the bringing of all denominations into any one of them. Overtures and attempts have been made in that direction, by some Christian bodies, reducing the terms of communion as low as possible, making the basis of fellowship as wide as was supposed consistent with their integrity. That proposal has been made by one of the smaller bodies but has been found to be practically fruitless. It is very much like asking all the people of the United States to become citizens of Rhode Island. The proposition to unite with any one denomination, even on the most favorable terms, can hardly be offered to churches, often more numerous, more widely dispersed, more powerful, and more efficient than the one making the invitation. That method is futile.

The only method that remains that is at all practicable at present, and one that is being applied with happy results in many directions, is that of federation—marriage and not mastication. It implies the provisional recognition of existing denominations or, at least, of so many of them as fulfil the conditions of federation. In pursuance of this policy, the churches belonging to one general family—most closely resembling one another in doctrine, polity, ordinances, will unite as rapidly as possible. Out of such

federation will come, slowly, perhaps, but surely, ultimate unity. This will follow the analogy of our civic growth, in which the nation grew out of the confederation of the colonies. That analogy might be crowded so as to walk on more than one leg, at least, out of the "all four." It is well known that at the close of our Revolutionary War, thirteen states, independent of each other, found themselves in a confederation which had the form of government but denied the power; that in those states commerce declined, friction and discontent ripened into open rebellion, and general confusion suggested general anarchy; that in this extremity, eleven of the thirteen states sent delegates to Philadelphia, who, after four months' deliberation put forth a Constitution which Mr. Gladstone pronounced "The most wonderful production ever struck off at a given time by the brain of man," under which the many were affiliated and the united people became prosperous and powerful. In this union of states each commonwealth is free to work out its own internal development. Massachusetts with her Puritan and Louisiana with her French ancestry do not interfere with each others' Sunday, marriage, temperance laws and the like, or forms of state, county, and town organization. The peculiar institutions of each are guaranteed by the authority of all. And yet we know how steadily and how surely this Union has grown into a compact, cohesive, organic nation.

So church unity does not necessarily involve uniformity. There may be the greatest variety and diversity within the limits of organic union, as witness the differences among brethren belonging to the same denomination. Liberty, large and generous, is consistent with ecclesiastical unity. The distinctions of "High," "Low," and "Broad" are found in each and all the denominations, Roman Catholic included. Men of the fundamental temperamental differences which appear in human nature have lived together in one church in the past and are living so today. No plan for Christian unity will gain acceptance or achieve success which contemplates the obliteration of all such differences. That eternal fact must be taken into account. God has made us different. We do not look alike and we do not think alike, and God never meant that we should. He never intended that the great orchestrated oratorio of religion should fall into one strain, the

various instruments playing one tone and the different voices joining in one monotonous note.

Perhaps we cannot hope to see the end of all our disunion for a long time to come. But all we have to do is to go on as we have been doing in recent years, and it will come about before we know it. For that matter, you can't stop it—you can't prevent that which God in his good and gracious providence is pushing on with powerful pressure. You might as well try to stop time elapsing by tying the pendulum or think to prevent sunrise by wringing the neck of the cock that announces it. But we can, in our day and generation, have a lot and part in this great matter. We can refuse any longer to encourage disunion, to justify it, to tolerate it. To all fostering party spirit, perpetuating partisan rancor we can cry out in the indignant protest of the apostle: "Has Christ been parceled into fragments?"

Oh, my brethren, do your best and utmost, I beseech you, in every possible way to break down the barriers between Christ's people. Let us never cease to be pained and penitent about this sin of separation. Let us face the facts, let us protest against them, let us repudiate them. They should not be, they need not be, they will not be. The church left the heart and hands of Christ one within and without, one in inward spirit, one in outward order, and we should never rest content until that condition is restored. To my mind ecclesiastical separation is schism and sin. The present condition of the churches of Christ is directly opposed to every purpose and principle made known to us in the New Testament. The church ought to be one externally. All who are in Christ should be ecclesiastically united. Every other arrangement is a rending of the body of Christ. Those who are one with him in spirit ought to be one with him and with one another in body. There can be nothing more sad and few things more hopeless than the excuses and extenuations which men give for the present disordered, unfriendly, even antagonistic condition of the church and seek to justify the unhappy and disastrous divisions, even going so far as to advocate the ridiculous idea that the cause of Christ is helped forward by the rivalries of numberless sects.

Oh, I pray you, set your face like a flint against all such

captious, specious arguments for a divided Christendom. "Speak, exhort, rebuke with all authority" those who still stand out against this clear and urgent duty of the Christian brotherhood. Be willing to make any concessions, yield any prejudice, defy any trivial tradition, ignore any incidental difference, if only we can hasten, even in the slightest degree, the time when all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth may be brought together and the whole church of God be one, as our Lord prayed it should be. "Prophecy, O son of man; say to the wind, Come from the four winds, O Breath, and breathe upon these slain that they may live," and there will yet be a shaking among the bones in the valley, be they never so dry and never so scattered, and the bones will come together, bone to his bone, and sinew and flesh and skin shall come upon them, and the church of God shall stand upon its feet, an exceeding great and victorious army.

#### CLOSING WORDS

DR. WILLETT: My brethren, we have come to the close of the third of three most notable days in the calendar of this church. I cannot but believe that these days have a place as an epoch-making event in the history of our common Christian faith. The men who have spoken upon this platform, both in the formal addresses and in the incidental conferences, have been men representative of widely different points of view and yet they have spoken with clearness, precision, Christian charity, and love upon these points.

We have had a very interesting programme and a most admirably balanced programme. We began with biblical instruction upon a great theme, the New Testament organization. We proceeded to the discussion of Christian theology at the very heart of the gospel. No theme is more impressive than that of the atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have taken up questions of practical utility in the community. The question of the limits of free speech in a republic is a question of public interest; the question of therapeutics in the church is one of practical Christian service.

We have now come in the last evening's session and this afternoon session to perhaps the most notable theme, that which has

had its illustration in the very coming together of these three bodies of Christian people, and I cannot but believe that the church, visible and invisible, is watching and will watch the interests here generated with exceeding interest. I cannot but believe that those who love our Lord Jesus Christ and who are among the living exemplars of his will, will regard this as a most notable epoch in the life of the church. And can we doubt that those who have entered into life, those who have joined the choir invisible and are looking upon this transaction—can we doubt that they are deeply concerned with the issues of these days in the deepening of Christian love and the bearing forward of those interests which we have upon our hearts?

That we can come down from this elevation with a sense of fairness, with a sense of brotherhood; that we can make these moments of fraternity habitual in the days to come; that we can here organize some practical steps toward that Christian union of which we have been thinking and talking, should be certainly our desire and prayer.

The closing words of this Congress will be spoken by representatives of the three bodies of Christian people here assembled. The first of these, representative of the Free Baptist brotherhood, will be Rev. Benjamin Franklin (Free Baptist), of Minneapolis.

REV. BENJAMIN FRANKLIN: It gives me pleasure to take this platform to speak for myself and, if I may, for my brethren, first of all, in expressing my personal appreciation and the appreciation of the three kinds of Baptist men who have been here assembled in this Congress, our appreciation, I say, of the work which has been done by those men who have had to do with the shaping of this gathering. We certainly must feel, my brethren, that a great amount of hard work has been done in getting together such a congress as this.

I have been delightfully at home during the meetings of this session, for three reasons: First, as my friend Rice of Minneapolis tells me, because I bear a name which the Disciples swear by; secondly, because I was a pastor of a Free Baptist church, but now I am a pastor of a Free Baptist and a Baptist church. If I could not here be at home, I would like to know who can.

It was worth while calling this Congress if we listened to nothing more, I am sure, than the three speakers of this afternoon. I wish I could measure in the sight of heaven the good that has come into my own life by listening to a Baptist, a Disciple, and a Free Baptist, as they spoke on this prayer of our Lord. My brethren, such a congress as this is bound to bring us closer together. I shall go back to my city with a heart better prepared to sympathize with my people and better fitted, I am sure, for the position to which the Lord has called me.

Now, in this closing word I can do nothing better, I am positive, than to state briefly how it comes that I am pastor of a Free Baptist and a Baptist church—the First Free Baptist Church and the Central Baptist Church of Minneapolis. I state this briefly for this reason: it simply shows that when all selfishness is laid aside and we come together with a single purpose to do Christ's work, we forget our differences and come to love one another and work harmoniously. We have been beginning at the wrong end of the proposition.

Now, the sad news came to the Central Baptist Church at the last of August of this year that their pastor was deprived of his health and must needs go to the Coast. He had to move out just when they were depending upon him to continue his work after his vacation. The First Free Baptist Church of Minneapolis had arranged to discontinue services in its own building for the month of September in order that certain repairs might be made. These conditions obtained. A deacon of each of these churches met on the street and began to tell each other their experiences in church work. They spoke of the difficulties that they were facing. Then they said, "Isn't there some way whereby we can hold union service for September and relieve the difficulty of the First Free Baptist Church and of the Central Baptist Church?"

They called a meeting of the boards of deacons and of the boards of trustees and arranged to hold all of the services for September in the Central Baptist Church. The pastor of the First Free Baptist Church, because he was able to do so, that is physically able to do so, officiated.

As that month grew to a close, some of the men got together and said, "Hold on. This is too good a thing to give up: We

cannot afford to stop; we have enjoyed this. We ought to have some plan of continuance." They called another meeting of the board of deacons and board of trustees of both churches and arranged this plan which is now working and which is expected to work at least until May 1, 1909: The morning service and the mid-week service are held in the Central Baptist Church; the union young people's meeting—because they have united—and the Sunday evening service, in the First Free Baptist Church; the Bible schools, in their separate churches. That plan is working sweetly. We even split our choir right in two, and I will tell you, brethren, there is nothing that explains harmony after such action as that except the dominance of the spirit of God. We had to dispose of or dispense with our contralto and bass and organist in the First Free Baptist Church; and had to dispense with the soprano and the tenor in the Central Baptist Church, and mix the choir in order that we might have a union movement, and we did it. In harmony, too, and there is a sweet spirit going on.

Just this word: Why is it that we are thus working in harmony today? Because those people got together and worked together for one purpose. I tell you when in our Sunday evening services one Sunday evening there stood up seven persons to begin the Christian life, and deacons of the Central Regular Baptist Church and deacons of the First Free Baptist Church came forward to talk to those men and women as they were on their knees, about Jesus Christ, their Savior, the Central Baptist Church and the First Free Baptist Church were welded together in such a way as they could not have been by a thousand years of voting.

Now, that is what we need to do, to get acquainted with each other. I am delighted to have become acquainted with my brethren in the ministry and fellow Christians, and those noble men who have arranged this Congress on this occasion.

DR. WILLETT: The representative of the Disciples of Christ in the closing remarks is Dr. Garrison, of St. Louis, the editor of the *Christian Evangelist*.

DR. GARRISON:

*Mr. President, and Brethren:* I feel on an occasion like this



something of the sensation which I have felt on ascending some mount of vision and getting a far wide view of the landscape. I feel that this has been a mountain top to which we have come, and I am sure we have seen visions. Let me mention a few of the things which I think we have seen.

First of all, we have seen that there are others. As I have listened to these great and godly men from these other religious bodies, many of whom I have not met before, and thank God for such men, I have at the same time had a feeling of regret that I have been so long deprived of their acquaintance, of their friendship, and their fellowship in Christ Jesus. Why should it be so? They are my brethren. Why should we not know each other better?

That passage of Paul came to my mind when he was rebuking the church at Corinth for their division. Said he, "Why, all things are yours. Why do you say, I am of Cephus, and I of Apollos, and I am of Paul, taking the little section of truth that each one of these may present to me? Why, it is all yours. All things are yours." And all these brethren are mine. These great and good men that have spoken to you on this platform during this congress belong to me and they belong to you. Why should we impoverish ourselves by rearing division walls that shut out from each other the goodly life and influence and teaching of such men?

That is the accusation I have against our modern denominationalism. It rears up walls of division and impoverishes the various members of the church by depriving them of riches which belong to them in common. We have seen that on this mountain top, the practicability of men coming together with differing minds on many minor questions, yet with a common faith in Jesus Christ, and discussing their differences in a fraternal spirit. That is a great thing for us to see and to realize, that we can be brethren and differ; and it suggests to us, as has been stated so ably on this platform this afternoon, that it is not necessary to have uniformity of opinion nor of methods of work and of worship in order to be one. We may be one in our common faith, in our common Lord and in our common life, with variety of opinions and methods of work and of worship; and if unity

is ever to come, and I think it will come, it will be large enough to comprehend all this variety of opinion in teaching and in work. So I think we have seen that, come to see it, perhaps, with clearer vision during this meeting than ever before.

We feel, therefore, that we are members one of another, brothers all under a common Master. Not that we are going to be one some time, but that we are one now, united together.

But here is the problem: How can we better manifest that unity to the world? That is the practical problem really before us. Well, one of the ways is just what we are doing now in holding this union congress in which we come together and speak to each other on these great vital problems, and convince ourselves as well as others who shall read these proceedings that we after all are one in the essential and fundamental things of our Christian faith and life.

Another way we may manifest it is by interchange of pulpits. I do not think we are doing enough of that. We may increase that largely, I think, and thereby increase the spirit of unity and manifest to the world the unity which already exists. Somebody has been bold enough to suggest on this platform that we might even have an exchange of the editorial tripods; the editors might exchange their editorial chairs. However that might be, one thing I am sure is practicable, and that is that we editors will cease misrepresenting each other and be fair and Christian in our criticisms of each other.

I do not know how much responsibility rests upon religious journals for the perpetuation of our divisions, but I am afraid there is a great responsibility resting upon us in that respect; and I want to say right now, in all frankness, that if any of you discover in the paper that I publish, a misrepresentation of another religious body, Roman, Protestant, or Catholic, if you will notify me of that fact I promise you here and now to make the *amende honorable*. I want to be fair to my brethren and I believe that if we quit misrepresenting each other's opinions, which we often do by quoting some cranky and cantankerous editor and representing his as the view of the whole people; if we would quit doing that and be fair and just to each other, and quote only representative men and representative leaders we should do a great deal to

promote our greater unity, and to manifest that unity which now exists to the world.

My friends, I feel that in this closing hour we have come into the very Holy of Holies. When we come into that upper chamber and hear the Master's prayer—that we all may be one, that the world may be redeemed—we are on holy ground. It makes us feel, as I think we do not feel often enough and deep enough, how godly men we ought to be, how humble men we ought to be, how spirit-filled men we ought to be to complete this holy cause of union. We have not always gone about it in the right spirit. We have tried to argue each other into unity; we have tried to drag each other into unity by logic; we have tried to force a spirit of unity sometimes, but it is not going to come that way. It is going to come by the way of love; it is going to come by the way of kindness, and fairness and humility; it is going to come in the very spirit of the Master who on that last night before his betrayal prayed that they all might be one in him.

Have you ever noticed, my brethren, that Jesus prayed for the sanctification of his disciples before he prayed for their unity? Their sanctification by the truth; as he was sanctifying himself for their sins, he prayed that they might be sanctified by the truth. And do you know, I am coming to feel in these later years of my life, that we can do no better thing for the sake of unity, to promote unity, than to seek a deeper consecration by the truth to the Lord Jesus Christ, putting away our carnality, putting away our pride in denomination, our pride of intellect, and in the spirit of humility and utter devotion to the cause of Jesus Christ, get close to him, and share his life, become one with him. Then I believe it will be easy for us to be one with each other.

I believe that we are on the road to that sort of preparation for unity when we study the Master's prayer and seek to get closer to his loving heart. My brethren, the skies are full of the signs of promise. When I measure the sentiment that exists today in the church with what existed even within my memory, I am amazed at the progress that has been made.

Why, I think I can remember the time when if Dr. Sanders had stood on any platform in Christendom and made the magnificent speech which he made here this afternoon that he would

almost have been turned out of the church; at least he would have been pelted by the denominational press from one end of this country to another. When the Sage of Bethany back yonder early in the century lifted up the banner of reform and said, "Divisions are sinful and God's people must get together," was he not scoffed at and abused, and was not the scheme of Christian union denounced as Utopian, if not even wicked? "For our denominationalism," said they, "is the normal state of the church, and God so ordained it." That was the view less than one hundred years ago. And I believe the time is coming, if not here now, when that great and good man who has been so much abused and misunderstood, whatever may have been his mistakes or excesses in other regards, will be honored throughout the Christian world for his bold advocacy of Christian union and his denunciation of the sin of schism in the body of Christ and his plea for a permanent and a lasting unity of the church on the basis of simple New Testament Christianity.

Now, here are some of the signs that I see written upon our moral heaven: Here is our great Christian Endeavor movement; here is our great union Sunday-school movement; here is a congress like this, a union congress which would not have been possible a few years ago; here is that great meeting yonder in New York City three years ago and another one to meet in a few weeks in Philadelphia, when Protestant Christianity in this country meet together through their representatives to ask the question, "How may this prayer of our Divine Lord be answered most speedily?" Oh, that is a sign of the times, my friends, at which my heart rejoices, when God's people can thus come together and sit at the feet of the Master and ask how his own prayer may be most speedily fulfilled that the world may be converted.

What is the meaning, my brethren, of this coming together, of these erstwhile scattered forces of the church there joining hands and hearts together in closer union? What is its meaning? I remember, in the army, when the scattered portions of the army were being brought together and massed at some point, even the common soldiers caught its significance and they said to each other, "Boys, there is going to be a great battle." Does not this

massing of our Christian powers under the leading of the spirit of Jesus Christ mean that our great captain is going to call for a forward march? He is massing his followers together for a great forward march on the ranks of heathenism and our own abominations for the purpose of subduing the whole world to the beneficent reign of himself under the divine Father. That, I believe, brethren, is the deepest meaning of this union movement. It is the conquest of this world in our Lord and Master.

DR. WILLETT: As representing the Baptists I have pleasure in calling upon Dr. W. C. Bitting, of St. Louis.

DR. BITTING: The Congress is making heavy draughts upon St. Louis in the closing hour, the preceding speaker being also a citizen of that great city.

In the vibrations of our lives there sometimes come nodes at regular intervals. I am experiencing one such this afternoon. A few years ago, in the great city of New York, in the interest of a great benevolent enterprise, there spoke upon the same platform representatives of the Methodist, the Dutch Reformed church, the Congregational, the Presbyterian, and the Episcopal churches. The speaker was the last in the long list. As nearly always happens upon such occasions, the last speaker suffered because of the undue prolixity of those who had gone before—I have no reference to this afternoon (laughter). He was tempted to say as Pat did, when told that he was in danger if he traveled on the last car of the train, "Why don't they leave off the last car?" (Laughter). I had the privilege, however, of saying at that time that after listening to those representatives of the different churches, "I felt like a Metho-Formed-Presby-Gational-Bapto-Palian." I then had the pleasure of sitting down.

I think it would be impossible to leave this place without having obliterated the sense of denominationalism. In the years gone by, our Congress was called by a very distinguished Baptist minister, "a herd of untamed mustangs prancing in an unfenced pasture." How long it took the originator of that very picturesque expression to elaborate all the features contained therein, we do not stop to say. But the Baptist Congress has always said, "We propose to prance." Alluding to some words of the last

speaker I may say that Dr. Sanders has run this identical risk of being turned out of churches by saying frequently for many years what he said this afternoon. Had he not been the chairman of the Baptist Congress Executive Committee perhaps he might have suffered. The Executive Committee has always been predisposed against fence building. It has always said that we must erect partitions which are to inclose mere closets in which men tuck away, to be guarded most jealously, conceptions of the Christian church, like neatly tied bundles, well knotted and sealed.

We have stood for the idea that Christian life and truth are not gems but germs. We are not running safe-deposit vaults, and are not attired in the livery of some ecclesiastical corporation, standing outside iron bars to hold fast to things that were delivered to us. We are busy growing plants in our own walls, and have come here from many places to show what kind of flowers we have been growing. We have simply gathered the bouquet made of blooms that God himself has grown.

Now, we are feeling this afternoon the valuable effects of the Congress. For, he that turneth an editor from the error of his ways shall save a denominational journal and shall hide a multitude of denominational sins. There is no man, however, in the United States who less needed conversion than the editor who has just spoken to us.

In 1890, in New Haven, this Congress discussed this very matter of Christian union from the point of view of the Anglican quadrilateral. The citizens of the United States refused to become citizens of Rhode Island at that time. It has been a continual desire of the members of the General Committee and of the Executive Committee of the Baptist Congress that we should show that, while the tones of our voices were not alike, there might be uttered the same great truth. That while the great theme was the same, there would inevitably be many variations of it.

Not many years ago I heard two groups of college boys of different fraternities singing their rival fraternity songs—we all know what that means. When finally tired and weary with that, one of the groups started up "Home, Sweet Home" and the other joined in "Sullivan's Lullaby," in the same key, and they sang

along in perfect harmony. I feel sometimes, when we shout our peculiar fraternity songs, that we are trying to rival others, and to outdo ourselves in vociferation of loyalty. But, if we can only get this note, that the only real home for any Christian man is in the heart of God, and that one is a rover if he is outside of the great and infinite love of the Father, who belongs to others as well as himself, we shall be united.

We peek over one another's fences and then see what wealth of manhood God has in other places than in our own denomination. Now, this is just where we are feeling today something of the power of our Congress.

I wish that our intelligent secretary might write an article for the papers in which he would show by study of the topics discussed by the Baptist Congress how many of these discussions have been but the preludes to advances by the Baptist denomination. I think he would have the grand finale of such a paper best illustrated by the discussions of this meeting of the Congress.

SECRETARY GESSLER: That would make a pretty good-sized book.

DR. BITTING: Well, you need not take in all the history. But now that we have gone outside, what are we going to do? The editor of one of our newspapers said to me, "The Congress had a good function when it started in the Baptist denomination." I can myself remember twenty-four years of it. The time was when a man who began to think in the terms of today found it difficult to get a hearing. The Congress was organized to give him an opportunity to say his say. We did not want anything on the safety valve. We wanted a place where what was inside of a man's soul could be talked about. Today the difficulty is to get the man who holds to the reactionary and extremely conservative side of questions to come to the Congress and utter himself. That is the reason we have fallen into disfavor in some quarters.

Now, is this mission in our own denomination to be given up? In some parts of the country some Baptists yet need the Congress. Perhaps some Disciples need it also. If all the Disciples and Baptists and Free Baptists were like those who have spoken upon

this platform, there never would have been any division between us. It is the other fellow who is not here who needs this Congress. We must take it to him, or get him to come to it. If we can get the full ministry of this Congress it will abundantly justify us in enlarging its scope, so that we can take in these other denominations.

And so we come to the close of this most delightful session, feeling that we are not here to be a mere congress of immersionists. We are not yet ready to take in Mormons. If all that these immersionist bodies, here represented, stand for is holding fast to a symbolic piece of religious ritualism, we are in the poorest business that ever occupied an aggregation of serious men. Now, the problem to be met before the extinction of the Baptist Congress, before the amalgamation of the Congress of Disciples with that of the Baptists, and the admission of Free Baptists, is, How can we deliver ourselves from that characterization as a congress of immersionists? Have we really gotten together? I know some Baptists, who, if you ask them why they are Baptists, drown in the Baptistry while telling you. This is the new problem that faces us. But God has given us grace to come to this hour, to meet the problems of our past, and to face the problems of our future.

Inter-denominationally we have here stood before problems of truth and of ecclesiasticism. Here is a great mountain. On the east the clouds have come out of the sea. They have condensed against the cold air of its summit. The floods have run down the slope toward the Orient and have corrugated it with ravines from top to base. On the north it is precipice, rock, lichen, stalactite and stalagmite of ice, deciduous trees. On the west is virgin forest from top to bottom, majestic, great, gloomy, inviting. On the south it is lawn and flowers and vines and sunshine. Four men stand around that mountain's base, at each of the cardinal points of the compass, and debate about it. They write books, they divide mankind into schools of thought, every man claiming that his view is the only true view of that mountain. At last it occurs to these men, that, as has been so magnificently suggested here in the second paper this afternoon, "We must climb; we must climb." As they work their way toward the top,



each hears a rustling in the bushes and becomes conscious that somebody else is engaged in the same task. When they come out upon the level spot at the top of the mountain, they look into one another's faces and laugh as they think, What fools we were at the bottom. Then they clasp their hands, bow their heads, and repeat together, "Our Father, who art in heaven! It is the same mountain."

DR. WILLETT: There is a single word of announcement to be made in connection with the answer which has been made to the overture of the Baptist Congress to the Disciples on the first afternoon of our session. Dr. Gates will make that announcement.

PROFESSOR ERRETT GATES: At the mixed gathering of all of us, the Free Baptists, Baptists, and Disciples, held the first afternoon of this Congress, the following resolutions were introduced by Dr. Lawson, I take it on behalf of the Executive Committee of the Baptist Congress, as well as on behalf of himself and his Baptist brethren:

*Resolved*, that we most heartily approve the election of our Disciples and Free Baptists ministers to membership in the Executive Committee which has already resulted in the enlargement of our programme for this Congress;

*Resolved*, that in order to unite the Disciples Congress with our own we request their Executive Committee, in conference with our own Executive Committee, to take immediate steps to perfect such a union.

These resolutions were unanimously approved at a joint meeting of Baptists and Disciples held at the close of one of the sessions of this Congress.

Since that time a meeting of the Disciples present at this Congress was held to consider and formulate a reply to the overture from our Baptist brethren and the result of this meeting was the adoption of the following resolutions:

*Resolved*: 1. That we express our deep appreciation of the large fraternity and Christian courtesy of the executive committee of the Baptist Congress in opening the programme of their Congress to the Disciples of Christ and receiving them to equal participation in its sessions.

2. That we recognize a joint Congress as a most necessary and im-

portant step and a providential agency in the promotion of closer relations between Baptists and Disciples.

3. That we express to the Executive Committee our hearty acceptances of their invitation and our readiness to join, in the permanent organization of a joint Congress on the basis of a representation and responsibility to be agreed upon by a joint committee of the two bodies.

4. That we request the Executive Committee of the Disciples' Congress to appoint a committee of three to act in conjunction with a similar committee of the Baptist Congress, to formulate the plan of a joint Congress which shall be laid before the Disciples' Congress for final action.

Since the adoption of the above, the following committee has been appointed by the Executive Committee of the Disciples Congress: Rev. I. J. Spencer, Lexington, Ky., chairman; Rev. A. B. Philputt, Indianapolis, Ind.; Rev. Errett Gates, Chicago, Ill.

This committee now awaits the appointment of a similar committee to act in conjunction with it on the part of the Baptist Congress.

DR. WILLETT: The final word of the Congress will be spoken by its president, Doctor Jackson.

PRESIDENT JACKSON: I must thank the Congress for coming again to Chicago. I thank you on behalf of the pastors of this city, the churches, and the community. As often as you come, you always do us good and this meeting has been the best of all. The coming together of these three bodies has been a new inspiration to us. How full this gathering has been of good things; full of fellowship, of inspiration and of wisdom. Some one asked a friend how it was that there was so much wisdom at Harvard. The friend said, "That is easy enough to explain. Each freshman that comes brings with him a little wisdom and the seniors do not take anything away." Now, I think you can afford to take some of this wisdom, some of this inspiration away with you. This great Congress is rich enough and full enough and wise enough to impart some of its goodness and wisdom and inspiration to all of us. Let us take it to our homes and to our churches.

One other word: I want to say as far as Chicago is con-

cerned that this union is pretty well consummated. The Baptists and Free Baptists are already united. When a Free Baptist comes to Chicago, he always comes into our churches. Here is one standing opposite me now who is just coming into my church, a good loyal Free Baptist. When we and the Disciples come together we have the same blessed bond of fellowship. I think there is less difference between the Baptists and the Disciples of Chicago than between the Baptists of this region and of some other parts of this country.

You know what Bishop Fallows said to us about sanctification. I think the way for us to do is to become sanctified in spots. We must come together in spots. We must come together here and there as we can, in love, in fellowship, and without force. In that way without knowing it we will finally become a single denomination. That is our hope and our prayer. Let us go back to our churches and to our homes and once more offer the prayer of our Lord, that all of his children may be one.

Let us now close by singing Hymn No 724, the second and fourth stanzas.

(The Congress joined in song.)

PRESIDENT JACKSON: The closing prayer will be offered by Doctor J. M. Philputt.

REV. J. M. PHILPUTT invoked the Divine blessing as follows:

#### CLOSING PRAYER

Our Heavenly Father, in this closing hour we thank thee with united hearts for all that this Congress has meant to us. For the inspiration of its great messages; for the sweetness of its blessed fellowship; for the strength that has come from the widening of our acquaintanceship, and from the touching of one spirit upon another. We bless thee especially for the Holy of Holies of this afternoon when we have been caught up with a great vision, and we pray thee that this great vision may abide with us; that it may be a kind of star by which we shall steer our future course and shall ever be to us a source of inspiration and comfort.

And now as we go down from this mount of privilege, as we face the mighty tasks that await us in the valley, we pray for divine equipment, for divine guidance. We thank thee for the word of our Christ, "Lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the world." Make us

more conscious of his presence; more sensible of his power, and may the Holy Spirit guide us into all truth.

We thank thee for the blessed fellowship of this Congress and we pray that that which has here been begun may become permanent in the history of the church, and that this may be but the beginning of a great movement for the union of God's people.


And now do thou cement our hearts in Christian love. Help us to speak the truth, but ever to speak it in the spirit of love, and may the burning spirit of our Lord's prayer abide in all our hearts and be ever our inspiration and help.

And now, may the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, our Father, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit, abide with us ever more. *Amen.*

*And the Congress stood adjourned.*

## MEETINGS OF THE BAPTIST CONGRESS

DATE	PLACE	PRESIDENT
1882.....	Brooklyn .....	George Dana Boardman, D.D.
1883.....	Boston .....	Alvah Hovey, D.D.
1884.....	Philadelphia .....	Henry G. Weston, D.D.
1885.....	New York .....	Thomas Armitage, D.D.
1886.....	Baltimore .....	William E. Hatcher, D.D.
1887.....	Indianapolis .....	Hon. William S. Holman, Jr.
1888.....	Richmond .....	Hon. J. L. M. Curry, LL.D.
1889.....	Toronto .....	Hon. David Mills, M.P.
1890.....	New Haven .....	Hon. Francis Wayland, LL.D.
1892.....	Philadelphia .....	Colonel Charles H. Banes.
1893.....	Augusta .....	Governor William J. Northen.
1894.....	Detroit .....	President A. G. Slocum, LL.D.
1895.....	Providence .....	President E. B. Andrews, LL.D.
1896.....	Nashville .....	President J. T. Henderson, A.M.
1897.....	Chicago .....	Adin A. Kendrick, D.D.
1898.....	Buffalo .....	Mr. H. P. Emerson
1899.....	Pittsburg .....	D. B. Purinton, LL.D.
1900.....	Richmond .....	A. P. Montague, LL.D.
1901.....	New York .....	Professor A. S. Bickmore, Ph.D.
1902.....	Boston .....	President D. W. Abercrombie, LL.D.
1903.....	Philadelphia .....	Russell H. Conwell, D.D., LL.D.
1904.....	Louisville .....	Jos. Benson Marvin, M.D., LL.D.
1905.....	Cincinnati .....	Gershom M. Peters, A.M.
1906.....	St. Louis .....	R. H. Jesse, LL.D.
1907.....	Baltimore .....	Mr. Eugene Levering
1908.....	Chicago .....	John L. Jackson, D.D.

 NOTE.—The Fall session of 1891 was transferred to the Spring of 1892. This left the year 1891 without any report.



